arXiv:hep-th/0306142v2 30 Sep 2003

SPIN-03/18
ITP-UU-03/27
hep-th/0306??

Exploring the holographic principle in asymptotically flat spacetimes via the BMS group

Giovanni Arcioni[a,1,2] and **Claudio Dappiaggi**[b,3],

[a] *Spinoza Institute and Institute for Theoretical Physics,*
Leuvenlaan 4, 3584 CE Utrecht, The Netherlands
[b] *Dipartimento di Fisica Nucleare e Teorica,*
Università degli Studi di Pavia, INFN, Sezione di Pavia,
via A. Bassi 6, I-27100 Pavia, Italy

Abstract

We explore the holographic principle in the context of asymptotically flat spacetimes. In analogy with the AdS/CFT scenario we analyse the asympotically symmetry group of this class of spacetimes, the so called Bondi-Metzner-Sachs (BMS) group. We apply the covariant entropy bound to relate bulk entropy to boundary symmetries and find a quite different picture with respect to the asymptotically AdS case. We then derive the covariant wave equations for fields carrying BMS representations to investigate the nature of the boundary degrees of freedom. We find some similarities with 't Hooft S-matrix proposal and suggest a possible mechanism to encode bulk data.

---

[1] Address after October 2003: The Racah Institute of Physics, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel.

[2] E-mail : G.Arcioni@phys.uu.nl

[3] E-mail : claudio.dappiaggi@pv.infn.it

Contents

1 Introduction 2

2 Origin of the asymptotic symmetry group and its role in the holographic context 4

3 Emergence of the BMS group in asymptotically flat spacetimes 6
3.1 BMS as asymptotic symmetry group 6
3.2 Penrose derivation of the BMS group 9
3.3 BMS subgroups and angular momentum 10

4 Bulk entropy and boundary symmetries 11
4.1 Bousso covariant entropy bound 11
4.2 Bulk entropy and BMS boundary symmetries 13
4.3 Difficulties in reconstructing spacetime and comparison with the AdS case 15

5 Representations of the BMS group 17

6 Wave equations 21
6.1 Wave equations for the BMS group 26
6.2 Generalizations of the BMS group and possible extensions of the results 34

7 Implications for the holographic mapping 34
7.1 Identifying boundary degrees of freedom 34
7.2 Similarities with 't Hooft S-matrix Ansatz for black holes . . 36
7.3 Remarks on the construction of a S-matrix 37

8 Concluding remarks 38

A Induced representations for semidirect product groups 39
A.1 BMS representations in Hilbert topology 42
A.2 BMS representations in nuclear topology 45

B Wave equations in fiber bundle approach 47

1 Introduction

Some years ago 't Hooft [1] proposed that the apparent paradoxes of black hole physics in local quantum field theory can be resolved if the fundamental theory of quantum gravity has degrees of freedom living on lower dimensional hypersurfaces with respect to the bulk spacetime on which information is encoded “holographically”.

This was motivated by the Bekenstein-Hawking formula for the black hole entropy $S_{BH} = A/4$, which says that the entropy goes like an area instead of a volume. It is thus commonly assumed that a holographic theory has a density of states equal to the Planck density. This implies an extreme reduction in the complexity of a physical system and it is implicitly stated that gravity is responsible for this huge reduction of the number of degrees of freedom. In other words, the usual way of counting states in QFT is highly redundant since if we try to excite more than $A/4$ degrees of freedom we end up with the formation of a black hole.

The holographic principle predicts then a quite considerable departure from conventional way of counting degrees of freedom in physical systems. We can imagine two ways of producing a holographic behaviour. One possibility is to preserve locality at the price of a sort of (very!) unusual “gauge symmetry” which should be able to give the correct counting required by the holographic bound. This is essentially the recent approach advocated by ’t Hooft [2]: one has “ontological” states which go as a volume as usual, while “equivalence classes” grow as a surface and the latter are supposed to produce (this mechanism is still to be explained) the area law in the case of black holes. This approach, of course, requires a reformulation of quantum mechanics itself.

Another option is to reconstruct spacetime starting from holographic data. In this case one has to explain how they are generated, their dynamics and how they can produce classical spacetime geometry. Locality is simply recovered a posteriori. AdS/CFT correspondence [3] gives a beautiful example of this kind of behaviour. Nevertheless, how to recover bulk locality seems still an open question and most important the whole approach assumes an equivalence between partition sums of gravity and gauge theory once asymptotically AdS boundary conditions are imposed. As we will see in the following this is a very special choice and the fact that a conventional QFT appears on the boundary is in some sense quite unique.

It is therefore interesting to see what happens in the case of different boundary conditions. In the present paper we simply explore from a general point of view the case of asymptotically flat spacetimes. As we will see there is a sharp difference with respect to the case of AdS boundary conditions and a unique (geometrical) reconstruction of spacetime seems unlikely, suggesting a somehow different way of encoding and storing bulk data. With the help of the covariant entropy bound [4] we analyse some aspects of the asymptotic symmetry group (ASG) of asymptotically flat spacetimes-the so called

Bondi-Metzner-Sachs (BMS) group- and the nature of the fields carrying its representations hoping to get some insights about a possible holographic description.

Organization of the paper

In Section 2 we review the notion of asymptotic symmetry group and discuss its role and importance in the context of the holographic principle.

In Section 3 we recall different derivations of the BMS group and examine some of its properties and subgroups. We concentrate in particular on the Penrose derivation, since more convenient for our holographic purposes. This resumée of the BMS group is also intended to give the reader some background and terminology for further applications.

In Section 4 we review and apply the covariant entropy bound proposed by Bousso [4] pointing out a connection between entropy production in the bulk and the corresponding symmetries of a candidate holographic description. We then compare the situation with asymptotically AdS spacetimes and underline differences.

In Section 5 we review the representation theory of the BMS group and show how to label different states. Details of BMS representation theory are contained in Appendix (A.1), (A.2); most of this material is used to construct covariant wave equations.

In Section 6 we construct indeed covariant wave equations for the BMS group using a general framework based on fiber bundle techniques. Comments on the possible meaning of the various little groups and their labels are also given at the end.

In Section 7 we try to interpret the results of Section 6 and explore possible features and aspects of a tentative holographic description. We note some similarities with 't Hooft horizon holography and suggest some further aspects to take into account for a holographic description.

We end up in Section 8 with some concluding remarks.

2 Origin of the asymptotic symmetry group and its role in the holographic context

In absence of gravity the isometry group of (Minkowski) spacetime is the well known Poincaré group, namely the semidirect product of the Lorentz group and translations. Once gravity is switched on, even if weak, the situation changes quite drastically: Lorentz transformations, i.e. the homogeneous part of the Poincaré group, still make sense at each point, but the Poincaré group as a whole is not of course any more an isometry of the manifold and "seems to vanish into thin air" [5].

One might think to use as a suitable generalization the general coordinate transformation group, in other words diffeomorphisms. However, they simply preserve the differentiable structure (the "smoothness") of the manifold and they are not so relevant from the physical point of view.

One therefore relies on the asymptotic symmetry group (ASG). Roughly speaking, this means that one adds a conformal boundary to the original manifold following Penrose prescription and considers asymptotic symmetries as conformal motions on the boundary preserving some structure defined on it. Of course, these symmetries need not to be extended to the bulk in general but they can play a role in the holographic reconstruction of spacetime. An explicit example is given in the AdS/CFT correspondence [3], where one "reconstructs" the bulk in the case of asymptotically AdS spacetimes [6]. This represents however a special case as we will see in the following, despite the common non-compactness of the boundary as in the case of asymptotically flat spacetimes.

It is important to stress that one is *free* to choose the conformal boundary, the choice being just a matter of convenience. In the set up proposed by Bousso [4], this means that there are many different ways to project the bulk into collections of "holoscreens". Note also the it seems natural to put the screen on the conformal boundary at infinity, but in principle *any* other choice is allowed. Again, from this point of view, AdS is a very special case, since there is a natural screen on the boundary of spacetime. We are going to consider asymptotically flat spacetimes and imagine the screen to be the null manifold $\Im$ at infinity but as said other choices can also be done in principle. One could also imagine to put the screen at spatial infinity, where there is some similarity to the null case from the point of view of the ASG (See comments at the end of Section 6).

The notion of ASG seems then particularly natural in the context of gravity once one goes beyond classical General Relativity: non local aspects, "hidden" at the classical level by choosing initial conditions for the solutions, should manifest themselves in the quantum regime, demanding and depending on the choice of boundary conditions.

3 Emergence of the BMS group in asymptotically flat spacetimes

In this section we briefly revisit the derivation of the BMS group and some of its properties. As said, the BMS group represents the ASG of asymptotically flat spacetimes. More properly it is a transformation pseudo-group of asymptotic isometries of the region close to infinity of the asymptotically flat (lorentzian) spacetimes [4]. There is however a derivation proposed by Penrose as a group of transformations living intrinsically *on* $\Im$. In this case the BMS group *is* the transformation group on the boundary $\Im$.[5]

>From the point of view of the holographic principle we are interested in the theory living on the boundary and its symmetry group. We therefore prefer to consider this "boundary description" of the BMS group as more relevant and fundamental for our purposes. Moreover, it keeps into account the degenerate nature of $\Im$, which one has to face up when choosing a null screen. For completeness, however, we review various derivations.

3.1 BMS as asymptotic symmetry group

The BMS group was originally discovered [7], [5] by studying gravitational radiation emitted by bounded systems in asymptotically flat spacetimes; it is the group leaving invariant the asymptotic form of the metric describing these processes. Quite generally, one can choose (u, r, θ, ϕ) coordinates close to null infinity and check that the components of the metric tensor behave like those of the Minkowski metric in null polar coordinates in the limit $r \to \infty$.

A BMS transformation (α, Λ) is then

$$\bar{u} = [K_\Lambda(x)]^{-1}(u + \alpha(x)) + O(1/r) \tag{1}$$

$$\bar{r} = K_\Lambda(x) r + J(x, u) + O(1/r) \tag{2}$$

$$\bar{\theta} = (\Lambda x)_\theta + H_\theta(x, u) r^{-1} + O(1/r) \tag{3}$$

$$\bar{\phi} = (\Lambda x)_\phi + H_\phi(x, u) r^{-1} + O(1/r) \tag{4}$$

where x is a point on the two sphere S^2 with coordinates (θ, ϕ), Λ represents a Lorentz transformation acting on S^2 as a conformal transformation and $K_\Lambda(x)$ is the corresponding conformal factor. Furthermore α is a scalar function on S^2 associated with the so called supertranslation subgroup. It represents the "size" of the group as we will see below.

---

[4] For the euclidean case see section 6.

[5] Recall that $\Im$ is the disjoint union of $\Im^+$ (future null infinity) with $\Im^-$ (past null infinity). In the rest of the paper we will refer to $\Im^+$ but because of the symmetry the same conclusions will hold on $\Im^-$ too in all cases unless differently specified.

The other functions are uniquely determined by (α, Λ) imposing

$$(\alpha_1, \Lambda_1)(\alpha_2, \Lambda_2) = (\alpha_1 + \Lambda_1\alpha_2, \Lambda_1\Lambda_2) \tag{5}$$

$$(\Lambda_1\alpha_2)(x) = [K_\Lambda(x)]^{-1}\alpha_2(\Lambda_1^{-1}x) \tag{6}$$

One immediately notices from (5) the structure of semidirect product. Therefore the BMS group $B = N \ltimes L$ is the semidirect product of the infinite dimensional supertranslation group N with (the connected component of the homogeneous) Lorentz transformations group L.[6]

An important point to keep in mind is that the ASG thus defined is *universal* since one gets the same group for all asymptotically flat spacetimes. This is quite surprising. In addition, the group is infinite dimensional due to the presence of extra symmetries which reflect the presence of gravity in the bulk.

It is also possible [8] to derive the BMS group B working in the unphysical spacetime and imposing differential and topological requirements on $\Im$, avoiding then asymptotic series expansions. In a sense, this is a finite version of the original BMS derivation, since one constructs a so called conformal Bondi frame in some finite neighborhood of $\Im$ and this finite region corresponds to an infinite region of the original physical spacetime.

Even if one is not working with an asymptotic expansion, we prefer to consider this derivation from a slightly different perspective with respect to the one of Penrose, who considers the emergence of the BMS working intrinsically on $\Im$. Actually, we are still working asymptotically, even if, in the unphysical space, the "infinite is brought to finite". Recall, however, that had we chosen another conformal frame we would have obtained an isomorphic group. In other words, covariance is preserved by differentiable transformations acting on $\Im$. This indeed motivated Penrose to work directly on the geometrical properties of $\Im$ as we will see below and it seems more convenient to investigate the holographic principle in this context.

Choosing $x^0 = u$, $x^A = (\theta, \phi)$ as coordinates on $\Im^+$ and $x^1 = r$ defining the inverse luminosity distance, the (unphysical) metric $g^{\mu\nu}$ in the conformal Bondi frame is thus

$$g^{\mu\nu} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & g^{01} & 0 \\ g^{01} & g^{11} & g^{1A} \\ 0 & g^{1A} & g^{AB} \end{bmatrix}$$

---

[6] We will consider $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$, the universal covering group of L.

Using the freedom of gauge choice of the conformal factor and imposing global and asymptotic requirements on $\Im$ one can write the metric (in a neighbourhood of $\Im$) as

$$g^{\mu\nu} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & q^{AB} \end{bmatrix}$$

where q^{AB} is the metric on the S^2 therefore time independent. One can eventually compute the generators ξ^μ of asymptotic infinitesimal transformations $x^\mu \to x^\mu + \xi^\mu$ by solving

$$\xi^{(\mu;\nu)} - (\Omega_{,\rho}\,\xi^\rho/\Omega)g^{\mu\nu} = 0. \tag{7}$$

One finds

$$\xi^A = f^A(x^B) \tag{8}$$

$$\xi^0 = \frac{1}{2}uf^A_{;A} + \alpha(x^B),\ \xi^1 = 0. \tag{9}$$

Setting the supertranslations $\alpha(x^A)$ to zero we get the (orthochronous) Lorentz group while setting the f^A to zero we get the group of supetranslations as expected.

These are exactly the Killing vectors found by Sachs [5] in studying radiation at null infinity. However, one interprets the notion of asymptotic symmetry as follows: one declares an infinitesimal asymptotic symmetry to be described by a vector field ξ^a (more precisely an equivalence of vector fields in the physical spacetime) such that the Killing equation $L_\xi g_{\mu\nu} = 0$ is satisfied to as good an approximation as possible as one moves towards $\Im$.

One can also consider another derivation of the BMS group proposed by Geroch [9]. In a nutshell, this procedure considers the ASG as the group of consometries of $\Im$, i.e. conformally invariant structures associated with $\Im$. More properly, these structures live on the so called "asymptotic geometry", a 3 dimensional manifold diffeomorphic to $\Im$ endowed with a tensor structure. We prefer to consider as truly intrinsic the derivation of Penrose which we discuss below. Note however that Geroch approach has received a lot of attention and has been adopted in particular by Ashtekar and (many) others to endow $\Im$ with a symplectic structure to study then fluxes and angular momenta of radiation at null infinity.

3.2 Penrose derivation of the BMS group

The derivation of Penrose is based on conformal techniques and the null nature of $\Im$ is explicitly taken into account. The underlying idea is the following: consider a motion in the physical spacetime; this will naturally generate a motion in the unphysical spacetime and in turn a conformal motion on the boundary. The latter can persist, even if the starting physical spacetime has no symmetry at all providing thus a definition of ASG. However the degenerate metric on $\Im$ does not itself endow sufficient structure to define the BMS group.[7]

The natural structure living on $\Im$ is that of a inner (degenerate) conformal metric, the topology being $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$; the "$\mathbb{R}$" represent the null geodesic $\Im$ generators with "cuts" given by two dimensional spacelike hypersurfaces each with S^2 topology. Choosing a Bondi coordinate system [10], one can indeed write the degenerate metric on $\Im^+$ as

$$ds^2 = 0.du^2 + d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2. \tag{10}$$

Using stereographic coordinates for the two sphere ($\zeta = e^{i\phi} cot(\theta/2)$) one has

$$ds^2 = 0.du^2 + 4d\zeta d\bar{\zeta}(1+\zeta\bar{\zeta})^{-2}. \tag{11}$$

and recalling that all holomorphic bijections of the Riemann sphere are of the form

$$f(\zeta) = \frac{a\zeta + b}{c\zeta + d} \tag{12}$$

with $ad - bc = 1$, one immediately concludes that the metric (10) is preserved under the transformations

$$u \rightarrow F(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \tag{13}$$

$$\zeta \rightarrow \frac{a\zeta + b}{c\zeta + d} \tag{14}$$

These *coordinate* transformations define the so called Newman-Unti (NU) group [11], namely the group of non reflective motions of $\Im^+$ preserving its intrinsic degenerate conformal metric.

The NU is still a very large group. One can restrict it by requiring to preserve additional structure on $\Im$. One actually enlarges the notion of angles and endows $\Im$ with "strong conformal geometry". In addition to ordinary angles one considers null angles: finite angles are formed by two different directions in $\Im$ at a point in $\Im$ which are not coplanar with the null direction in $\Im$, while null angles are formed by two directions at a point in $\Im$ which are coplanar with the null direction.

---

[7] More precisely, one considers a future/past 3 asymptotically simple spacetime, with null $\Im^+$,$\Im^-$ and strong asymptotic Einstein condition holding on it [10].

One can show that the set of strong conformal geometry preserving transformations restricts the u transformations of the NU group to the following form

$$u \rightarrow K(u + \alpha(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})) \tag{15}$$

with

$$K = \frac{1 + \zeta\bar{\zeta}}{(a\zeta + b)(a^*\zeta^* + b^*) + (c\zeta + d)(c^*\zeta^* + d^*)} \tag{16}$$

the same appearing in (6) and $\alpha(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ an arbitrary function defined on the two sphere. But then this set of transformations together with the conformal transformations on the two sphere define precisely the BMS group as shown before.

Note that in terms of this intrinsic description, these transformations have to be interpreted not as coordinate transformations but as *point* transformations mapping $\Im$ into itself. In other words, a conformal transformation of $\Im$ induces conformal transformations between members of families of asymptotic 2-spheres when moving along the affine parameter u.

This construction further motivates the mapping between $\Im$ and the so called cone space[12], which we are going to discuss in the following as a possible abstract space where the holographic data might live.

Finally one has to remember that the global structure of the BMS group in *four* dimensions cannot be generalized to a generic dimension as $BMS_d = N_{d-2} \ltimes SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ where N_{d-2} is the abelian group of scalar functions from S^{d-2} to the real axis; an example is the three dimensional case where [13] it has been shown that $BMS_3 = N_1 \ltimes Diff(S^1)$. In what follows we are always going to work in *four* dimensions.

3.3 BMS subgroups and angular momentum

We review a bit more in detail the BMS subgroups. One has the subgroup N given by

$$u \rightarrow u + \alpha(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \tag{17}$$

$$\zeta \rightarrow \zeta \tag{18}$$

known as supertranslations. It is an infinite dimensional abelian subgroup; note that

$$\frac{BMS}{N} \simeq SO(3,1) \simeq PSL(2,\mathbb{C}), \tag{19}$$

which follows from the fact that the BMS group is the semidirect product of N with SL(2,C). Choosing for the conformal factor K on the sphere

$$K = \frac{A + B\zeta + B^*\bar{\zeta} + C\zeta\bar{\zeta}}{1 + \zeta\bar{\zeta}} \tag{20}$$

one has the subgroup T^4 of translations which one can prove to be the unique 4-parameter normal subgroup of N.

On the other hand, the property of a supertranslation to be translation free is *not* Lorentz invariant. Therefore there are several Poincaré groups at $\Im$, one for each supertranslation which is not a translation, and none of them is preferred. This causes the well known difficulties in asymptotically flat spacetimes in defining the angular momentum, the origin basically being "free" (because of the presence of gravity). We recall for completeness the reason: in Minkowski space-time, the angular momentum is described by a skew symmetric tensor which is well-defined up to a choice of an origin. Whereas this last condition is equivalent to fix 4 parameters, in the case of $\Im$ this condition requires an infinite number of parameters to fix the "orbital" part of the angular momentum since the translation group T^4 is substituted by the supertranslations N.

Although many ways to circumvent this problem have been proposed, no really satisfactory solution has emerged until now. In [14], [15] one ends up with a reasonable definition of angular momentum in asymptotically stationary flat space-times, where the space of good cross sections (i.e. sections with null asymptotic shear) is not empty; one can then select a Poincaré subgroup from the BMS group and define accordingly the angular momentum. We are going to examine in more detail the notion of good/bad sections in the following so as to discuss bulk entropy production from the point of view of boundary symmetries.

4 Bulk entropy and boundary symmetries

4.1 Bousso covariant entropy bound

We start with a very brief review of Bousso covariant entropy bound. We refer to [4] for more details and examples. Here we just recall the relation between entropy and focusing of light rays examining then this link from the point of view of BMS symmetries acting on null infinity.

Bousso bound represents a covariant generalization of the well known Bekenstein bound, the latter being a sort of spacelike version of the former. According to this more general recipe, the entropy of matter that flows through lightsheets associated with a given two dimensional spacelike surface in spacetime is bounded by the area of that surface.

Bousso bound holds under some assumptions and it can be in principle violated by quantum effects. It therefore gives entropy estimates at the classical level. Nevertheless, it provides a general formulation of the holographic principle and one can construct "screens" on which the entire bulk information can be projected and stored.

Lightsheets play a fundamental role in this set up. This is not surprising, since General Relativity at the classical level can be thought as a series of "lenses" filling spacetime! We recall indeed that once the two dimensional spacelike surface A has been chosen one defines lightsheets of A, L(A), as a null hypersurface that is bounded by A and constructed by following families of light rays orthogonally away from A, such that the cross sectional area is everywhere decreasing or constant. If S represents the entropy "inside" on any one of its L(A), then the bound predicts S less or equal to A/4.

One follows the light rays till they end up with a caustic in spacetime, i.e. the expansion θ goes from minus infinity to plus infinity. The change of expansion θ along a congruence of light rays is described by Raychaudhuri equation

$$\frac{d\theta}{d\lambda} = -\frac{1}{D-2}\theta^2 - \sigma_{ab}\sigma^{ab} + \omega_{ab}\omega^{ab} - 8\pi T_{ab}k^a k^b \tag{21}$$

Since the twist vanishes for L and the last term will be non positive assuming null energy condition if follows that the r.h.s is never positive and by solving

$$\frac{d\theta}{d\lambda} < -\frac{\theta^2}{D-2} \tag{22}$$

one gets to the focusing theorem predicting an infinite value of the expansion at the caustics due to bending light matter.

So energy costs entropy and the latter focuses light and allows for the formation of caustics. More entropy crosses the lightsheets, faster the lightsheets end up. A system in which light rays end up with some sort of percolation or random walk has therefore more entropy than a system where they terminate in a point. A spherically symmetric system will have less entropy then a system in which inhomogeneities are present: lightsheets in the second case will have to probe small scale density fluctuations and these spacetime irregularities will be associated with more entropy.

In the following we would like to interpret bulk irregularities which are responsible for entropy production from the point of view of BMS boundary symmetries, identifying explicitly those which correspond to low/high entropic bulk configurations.

Before doing this we would like to observe that the screen construction that one can eventually activate following Bousso approach -i.e. the projection and the storing of bulk information on suitable screens- is background dependent and also depends on the asymptotic structure of spacetime. As already mentioned before, choosing an asymptotic structure of spacetime is a matter of convenience, General Relativity being perfectly defined by itself.

4.2 Bulk entropy and BMS boundary symmetries

As previously recalled the BMS group is defined as those mappings acting on $\Im$ which preserve both the degenerate metric and the null angles.
In the case of null infinity, one can associate a *complex* function $\sigma(r, u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, which in physical terms is a measure of the shear of the null cones which intersect $\Im^+$ at constant u. To define the shear one chooses a spinor field O^A whose flagpole directions point along the the null geodesics of the congruence. The complex shear σ is then defined as follows

$$O^A O^B \nabla_{AA'} O_B = \sigma \bar{O_{A'}} \qquad (23)$$

The argument of the shear σ defines the plane of maximum shear and its modulus the magnitude of the shear. Now in the case of mild divergence of null geodesics (as with the Bondi-type hypersurfaces we are considering) one has

$$\sigma = \frac{\sigma^0}{r^2} + O(\frac{1}{r^3}) \qquad (24)$$

The quantity σ^0 is r independent and it is a measure of the *asymptotic* shear of the congruence of null geodesics intersecting $\Im^+$ at constant u. The r independence is in agreement with the peeling-off [16] properties of the radiation.

One can also read the shear from the asymptotic expansion of the metric. Consider for example the metric originally proposed by Sachs [5]

$$ds^2 = e^{2\beta} V r^{-1} du^2 - 2e^{2\beta} du dr + r^2 h_{ab}(dx^a - U^a du)(dx^b - U^b du) \qquad (25)$$

with a, b indices running over angular coordinates and V, β, U^a, h_{ab} are functions of the coordinates (u, r, θ, ϕ) to be expanded in $1/r$ powers. The shear appears in the expansion of the function β

$$\beta = -\sigma(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})\sigma^*(2r)^{-2} + O(r^{-4}) \tag{26}$$

Now when $\sigma^0 = 0$, i.e. the asymptotic shear of the congruence of null geodesics vanish at infinity, one has "good" cross sections. On the other hand, when non vanishing, one has "bad" sections. The latter corresponds to null geodesics ending up with complicated crossover regions in the bulk. Good cross sections do not exist in general spacetimes. However, a very special situation occurs in stationary spacetimes: in this case one can find asymptotic shear free sections and the space of such cuts is isomorphic to Minkowski space time, where a good section corresponds trivially to the lightcone originating from a point in the bulk. Of course in the case of stationary spacetimes points of the isomorphic Minkowski space are not in one to one correspondence with points of the physical curved spacetime; the behaviour in the bulk of null geodesics will be however quite mild (compared to bad sections) to end up in an almost clean vertex.

The intersection of the congruence of null geodesics originating from the bulk with $\Im$ is a connected two dimensional spacelike surface so we can apply the covariant entropy bound and deduce that bad cross sections will in general correspond to more entropic configurations from bulk point of view. Indeed in the case of bad cross sections lightrays "percolate" more than in the case of good sections, producing therefore more entropy.

One can say more and relate the notion of good/bad cuts to BMS boundary symmetries, having in mind a tentative holographic description. Indeed, under BMS supertranslations the transformation rule among asymptotic shears is

$$\sigma^{o'}(u', \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \sigma^o(u' - \alpha, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + (\eth)^2\alpha(\theta, \phi) \tag{27}$$

where the operator $\eth$ on the r.h.s is the so called "edth" operator (for a definition see [16]). One is then interested in finding transformations which produce new good cuts. For Minkowski spacetime and (remarkably!) again stationary spacetimes one can map good cuts into good cuts by means of translations and in these cases the BMS group can be reduced to the Poincaré group by asking for the subgroup of the BMS transformations which map good cuts into good cuts. In the general case, however, there are no good, i.e. asymptotic shear free sections, and from BMS point of view this corresponds to not Lorentz free supertranslations.

Applying therefore the covariant entropy bound one finds that bad sections correspond to more entropic configurations in the bulk and (not Lorentz free) supetranslations on the boundary. Time dependence produces more irregularities in the bulk giving therefore more entropy according to previous considerations; this is interestingly reflected in complicated supertranslations acting on the null boundary.

If holographic data are stored then in the S^2 spheres on $\Im$ some of them will contain more/less information corresponding to more/less entropy in the bulk. We return to this point in Section 7.

As said, asymptotic vanishing shear allows to reduce the BMS goup to Poincaré. One might think to start from the stationary case then for simplicity. There is still however a remnant of supertranslations. Suppose indeed to consider a system which emits a burst of radiation and it is stationary before and after the burst. The corresponding Poincaré subgroups will be different and they will have in common *only* their translation group. They will be related by means of a non trivial supertranslation in general. This is quite different from what happens in the AdS case as we are going to see in the next Section.

4.3 Difficulties in reconstructing spacetime and comparison with the AdS case

We now continue the previous analysis and make some comparisons with the AdS case.

Let us consider again the asymptotic shear. The previous picture tells us that the ASG can be reduced to Poincaré in some specific points along the boundary where the asymptotic shear does indeed vanish. This means that small shapes are preserved asymptotically as we follow the lines generating the null congruence using to construct the lightsheets. However, lightsheets acquire in general shear in the asymptotic region. This is due tidal forces which are responsible for the bending of light rays. But these are in turn described by the (asymptotic) Weyl tensor and this quantity (more properly the rescaled one in the unphysical metric) enters into the definitions of the so called Bondi news functions [5] which measure the amount of gravitational radiation at infinity. There is however another tensor, namely the Bach tensor (recall we are in four dimensions) $B_{\alpha\beta}$ which does not vanish in the presence of non zero Bondi news. In the case of asymptotically flat spacetimes it is *not* zero asymptotically. This is in *sharp* contrast with asymptotically AdS cases, where it vanishes asymptotically, the Bondi news being zero in that case. Actually the condition $B_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ on $\Im$ *is* used in the definition [17] of asymptotically AdS spacetimes.

This has however deeper consequences for holography. In AdS case this allows to reduce (enormously) the diffemorphism group on the boundary precisely to the conformal group. There is then (as already noticed in [17]) a discontinuity in taking the limit $\Lambda \to 0$ of the cosmological constant. In asymptotically flat spacetimes it means that one cannot propagate the boundary data to reconstruct the bulk in a *unique* way. And this was the essence of the Fefferman-Graham theorems for the AdS case [18]. We therefore see a remarkable difference. As a consequence, it also seems quite unlikely that GKPW (Gubser-Klebanov-Polyakov-Witten) prescription relating bulk-boundaries partition functions holds in this case. It seems also difficult to recover a S-matrix for asymptotically flat spacetimes starting from AdS/CFT and taking then the large radius limit of AdS.

As observed before, in general backgrounds the asymptotic shear does not vanish and therefore we remain with a big group on the boundary. Notice that using relativistic generalization of Navier-Stokes theory one can show that precisely the Bach current [19] can be used to describe entropy production in the bulk in the case of non stationary spacetimes. We see therefore that all the times (basically the majority) we cannot reduce BMS supertranslations to translations we have more entropy production in the bulk according to the covariant entropy bound and the production of this entropy can be measured in a quantitative way just by using the Bach current, a quantity which translates the effect of the bending of light before the system reaches equilibrium.

The fact that boundary symmetries cannot be reduced as in AdS case suggests not only that the propagation in the bulk is not unique (therefore we don't see the possibility of a naive holographic RG) as in AdS case but also that a degree of non locality[8] will be present-because of the impossibility of reducing the big symmetry group in general- in the candidate boundary theory, where fields will carry in general representations of the BMS group.

This motivates the following analysis of wave equations for the BMS group.

---

[8] The emergence of non locality in asymptotically flat spacetimes can also be explained considering again light propagation. Indeed, in AdS/CFT the amount of time required for a light ray to cross AdS diagonally is equal to the amount of time the light ray needs to " go around the boundary". This is not true in flat space. Therefore it seems unlikely that the holographic dual to asymptotically flat spacetimes will be a local theory.

5 Representations of the BMS group

As said our target is to write (covariant) wave equations as commonly done in physics for other groups [20]. We therefore first review very briefly in this Section the representation theory of the BMS group (See Appendix A.1 and A.2 for details). We recall the situation for the Poincaré group to compare then similarities and differences with respect to the BMS case. We give the "kets" to show explicitly the labelling of the corresponding states. Theory and definitions used in induced representations of semidirect product groups are reviewed in Appendix A.

Poincaré group

In this case we deal with $P = T^4 \ltimes SL(2,C)$ whose little groups and orbits are well known and are summarized in the following table (see [21] and [22])[9]:

Little group	orbit invariant	representation label
$SU(2)$	$p^2 = m^2$, sgn(p_0)	discrete spin j (dim=2j+1)
$SU(1,1)$	$p^2 = -m^2$,	discrete spin j'
$E(2)$	$p^2 = 0$, sgn(p_0)	∞-dimensional,
$E(2)$	$p^2 = 0$, sgn(p_0)	1-dimensional λ.

We first notice that the generators of T^4 can be simultaneously diagonalized and for this reason the orbit is the spectrum of energy. We have to impose some physical restrictions, namely we call unphysical those representations related to negative square mass and negative sign of p_0. Unfortunately, this is not enough since we have to deal with a continuous spin coming from $E(2)$. This case is excluded by hand and so we end up with two spin quantum numbers, i.e. j from $SU(2)$ and λ from $E(2)$; therefore the general ket for the Poincaré group is

$$\mid \mathbf{p}, j>, \quad \mid \mathbf{p}, \lambda>, \tag{28}$$

---

[9] The Lie algebra of the 2-d Euclidean group is:

$$[L_3, E_\alpha] = i\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} E_\beta,$$

$$[E_\alpha, E_\beta] = 0.$$

The two Casimirs of the group are E^2 and $C_2 = exp(2\pi i L_3)$ where $C_2 = \pm 1$ (integer and half-integer values of L_3). The two $E(2)$ are actually the same group with different representations depending if the value of the Casimir operator E^2 is different (first case) or equal (second case) to zero respectively for massive and massless states.

BMS group

In this case one has additional freedom since one is *free* to choose the topology for supertranslations. This is due to the fact that $\Im$ is not a Riemannian manifold: it is degenerate precisely in the directions along which supertranslations act. Having in mind Penrose description of the BMS as an *exact* symmetry acting of $\Im$, arbitrary supertranslations functions describe indeed symmetry transformations along $\Im$. The standard choice [23], [24] made in the literature is Hilbert or nuclear topology. The former should be associated with bounded systems (for which indeed the BMS group turns out to be the asymptotic symmetry group as originally discovered), while the latter with unbounded (See section 7.3 for the role of unbounded systems).

We first consider the Hilbert topology-i.e. we endow N with the ordinary L^2 inner product on S^2. Following [23] , [25], we remember that the supertranslations space can be decomposed in a translational and a supertranslational part

$$N = A \oplus B,$$

where only A is invariant under the action of $G = SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ and $T^4 = \frac{N}{B}$. Furthermore there is also this chain of isomorphisms:

$$N \sim \hat{N} \sim N' \sim N,$$

where $\hat{N}$ is the character space and N' is the dual space of N. This means that given a supertranslation α we can associate to it a character $\chi(\alpha) \doteq e^{if(\alpha)}$, where the function $f(\alpha) =< \phi, \alpha >$ and where $\phi \in N$.

The dual space can be decomposed as $N' = B^0 \oplus A^0$, where B^0 and A^0 are respectively the space of all linear functionals vanishing on B and A and where only A^0 is G-invariant. Also the following relations are G-invariant i.e.

$$(N/A)' \sim A^0 \quad N'/A^0 \sim A'. \tag{29}$$

In view of the isomorphism between N' and N, we can expand the supermomentum ϕ in spherical harmonics as

$$\phi = \sum_{l=0}^{1} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} p_{lm} Y_{lm} + \sum_{l>1} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} p_{lm} Y_{lm},$$

where the first term lies in B^0 and the second in A^0.[10]Relying on (29), we can think of the coefficients p_{lm} with $l = 0, 1$ as the components of the Poincaré momentum. Thus, we call the dual space of N the supermomentum space and define a projection map:

$$\pi : N' \to N'/A^0,$$

assigning to each supertranslation ϕ a 4-vector $\pi(\phi) = (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3)$.

At the end of the day one ends up with [25]

Little group	orbit invariant	representation label
$SU(2)$	$p^2 = m^2$, $\text{sgn}(p_0)$	discrete spin j (dim=2j+1)
Γ	$p^2 = m^2$, $\text{sgn}(p_0)$	discrete spin s
Γ	$p^2 = 0$, $\text{sgn}(p_0)$	discrete spin s
Γ	$p^2 = -m^2$,	discrete spin s
Θ	$p^2 = m^2$, $\text{sgn}(p_0)$	discrete spin s
$\tilde{C}_n$	$p^2 = m^2$, $\text{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dimensional k,
$\tilde{C}_n$	$p^2 = 0$, $\text{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dimensional k,
$\tilde{C}_n$	$p^2 = -m^2$,	finite dimensional k,
$\tilde{D}_n$	$p^2 > 0$, $\text{sgn}(p_0)$ (for $p_0 > 0$)	finite dimensional d_n,
$\tilde{D}_n$	$p^2 < 0$	finite dimensional d_n,
$\tilde{T}$	$p^2 > 0$, $\text{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dimensional t.
$\tilde{O}$	$p^2 > 0$, $\text{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dimensional o.
$\tilde{I}$	$p^2 > 0$, $\text{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dimensional i.

Therefore the general kets of the BMS group for massive and non massive particles[11] are:

$$\mid \mathbf{p}, j, s, k, d_n, t, o, i >, \quad \mid \mathbf{p}, s, k >, \tag{30}$$

where the new quantum numbers were originally interpreted as possible internal symmetries of bounded states [25],[26],[27] and the BMS group was indeed proposed to substitute the usual Poincaré group to label elementary particles due to the absence of non compact little groups and therefore of continuous spins.

---

[10] One can interpret the piece belonging to A^0 as composed of spectrum generating operators, while those in B^0 act on the vacuum in the context of a holograhic description. We thank J. de Boer for the remark.

[11] In the BMS group the massive and the massless kets are both labelled by discrete quantum numbers related to faithful representations of (almost the same) compact groups whereas in the Poincaré case massless states are labelled by the discrete number of the unfaithful representation of the non compact group $E(2)$.

Choosing a different topology for supertranslations, however, one registers the appearance of non compact little groups in the BMS representations theory too [28]. We believe that precisely for this reason the hope to use BMS group to label elementary particles was abandoned. However another interpretation of these numbers has been suggested as we are going to see soon.

Consider then the ket for the nuclear (or finer) topology. First of all, recall that in this case it is impossible to have an exaustive answer since not much is known about discrete subgroups. Nevertheless we have [24]

Little group	orbit invariant	representation label
Γ	$p^2 = m^2, 0, -m^2$, $\mathrm{sgn}(p_0)$	discrete 1 dim. spin s
$SU(2)$	$p^2 = m^2$, $\mathrm{sgn}(p_0)$	discrete $2j+1$-dim. spin j
Δ	$p^2 = 0$, $\mathrm{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dim. δ or ∞ dim.
S_1	$p^2 = 0$, $\mathrm{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dim. s_1
S_2	$p^2 = 0$, $\mathrm{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dim. s_2
S_3	$p^2 = 0$, $\mathrm{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dim. s_3
S_4	$p^2 = 0$, $\mathrm{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dim. s_4
S_5	$p^2 = 0$, $\mathrm{sgn}(p_0)$	finite dim. s_5

We omit the study of little groups with $m^2 < 0$ since in principle they have no physical relevance. Thus the general ket for the BMS group in the nuclear topology is:

$$|\mathbf{p}, j, s, \{t_n\}>, \quad |\mathbf{p}, j, s, \delta, \{s_n\}> \tag{31}$$

where the first case refers to faithful representations with $m^2 > 0$ and the index $\{t_n\}$ stands for all the representation numbers of finite groups; the second ket instead refers to the massless case and $\{s_n\}$ stands for all the representation numbers of the non connected groups.

Note that it is because of the infinite dimensionality of supermomentum space that one has non-connected or even discrete little groups, since one can have a lot of invariant vectors in this case. This is quite unfamiliar, since angular momenta are normally associated with connected groups of rotations. From an experimental point of view this also renders problematic the measurement of these “Bondi spins” as they are normally called. Indeed only in the case of the little group $SU(2)$ BMS representations contain a single Poincaré spin, otherwise they contain a mixture of Poincaré spins. Note also a curious fact: for $m^2 > 0$ all bosons with the same mass appear in the same multiplet while all fermions with the same mass appear in the same multiplet though corresponding to different representation.

6 Wave equations

In this Section we derive the covariant wave equations for the BMS group. As remarked before and in the following, nuclear (or even finer) topology is expected to be associated with unbounded systems, perhaps with infinite energy too. This would require in general Einstein equations in distributional sense and a different notion of conformal infinity. We therefore restrict to the Hilbert topology describing bounded systems in the bulk.

Canonical wave equations have been suggested in [23], though physicists normally use covariant wave equations. To derive them we use the theorem contained in [29] which shows how to get irreducible covariant wave functions starting from (irreducible) canonical ones. The framework- based on fiber bundle techniques, is quite general and elegant. For definitions and notations see Appendix B, which we suggest to read before this Section.

We are also going to use sort of diagrams in the discussion which, although not completely rigorous, may help to handle the formalism easier.

Consider then the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
G = N \ltimes SL(2,\mathbb{C}) \arrow[r, "\Sigma"] \arrow[d, "\pi"] & GL(V) \arrow[d, "*"] \\
N & F(N,V) \arrow[l, "\pi'"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

The representations induced in the above way are usually referred as *covariant*. Since the bundle is topologically trivial i.e. $G = N \times SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ we are free to choose a global section $s_0 : N \to G$ and the natural choice is $s_0(n) = (n, e)$; it is possible to see from (60) that $\gamma_0((n,k), n') = (0, k)$ which implies that the matrix $A(g, n') = \Sigma(\gamma(g, n'))$ (see Appendix B for definitions) does not depend on the choice of the supertranslation n' whereas this fails for induced representations. The only problem for covariant representations is that in general they are not irreducible even if Σ is, but as said a method [29] to compare covariant and induced representations was formulated. Consider indeed the following “diagram”:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
G \sim \hat{G} = \hat{N} \ltimes SL(2,\mathbb{C}) \arrow[r, "\Sigma"] \arrow[d, "\pi"] & GL(V)\ \ , \arrow[d, dashed, "*"] \\
\hat{N} & \hat{F}(\hat{N},V) \arrow[l, "\pi'"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\hat{N}$ is the character space of N and $\hat{F}$ is the bundle $\hat{N} \ltimes SL(2,\mathbb{C}) \times_{SL(2,\mathbb{C})} V$. Thus we can introduce a $\hat{T}$ representation acting on the sections of $\Gamma(\hat{F})$:

$$\hat{T}(n,k)\hat{\psi}(k\chi) = (k\chi)(n)k\hat{\psi}(\chi),$$

which is a transposition of

$$\hat{T}(g)\hat{\psi}(g\chi) = g\hat{\psi}(\chi). \tag{32}$$

Using the natural section (in the character space) $\hat{s}_0(\chi) = (\chi, e)$, the action of the group G on the function $\hat{f} : \hat{N} \to V$ is given from (32) by

$$\left(\hat{T}_{s_0}(n,k)\hat{f}\right)(k\chi) = (k\chi)(n)\Sigma(k)\hat{f}(\chi), \tag{33}$$

which we can refer to as the *covariant wave equation*. The relation between induced and covariant representations can be made now choosing a fixed character on an orbit Ω (physically speaking going on shell) and denoting with σ the representation of $K\chi_0$ subdued by Σ.

The essence of the Theorem contained in [29] is that if W is the canonical representation of G in $\Gamma(F)$ induced from $\chi_0\sigma$ than there exists an isomorphism of bundles $\rho : F \to \hat{F}_\Omega$ such that the map $R : \Gamma(F) \to \Gamma(\hat{F}_\Omega)$ defined by $R\psi(\chi) = \rho(\psi(\chi))$ satisfies

$$R \circ W = \hat{T}_\Omega \circ R,$$

which states the equivalence between W and $\hat{T}_\Omega$. Notice that with $\hat{T}_\Omega$ and with $\hat{F}_\Omega$ we simply refer to the (on shell) restriction on the $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$-orbit. The above framework can be applied for a given group $G = N \ltimes H$ as follows:

1. identify all little groups $H_\chi \subset H$ and their orbits (labelled by Casimir invariants)
2. construct a representation induced from H_χ and choose a section for the bundle $G\left((G/G_\chi), \pi, G_\chi\right)$,

3. construct the canonical wave equations for each little group.

4. construct the covariant wave equation starting from a representation of H upon the choice of a section of the fiber bundle $G(N, \pi, H)$. Write the covariant wave equation in the dual space.

5. relate the induced and the covariant wave equations restricting the latter to the orbit of a little group and then defining a linear transformation V acting on functions given by

   $$V = U_\lambda(s^{-1}(p)),$$

   where U is the representation of H and s is the section chosen at point (2).

6. since the representation U is in H and it is reducible, it is necessary to impose some constraints (i.e. projections) on the wave functions corresponding to the reduction of the representation U to one of the little groups.

Poincaré group

We review first how the above construction applies to the Poincaré group $T^4 \ltimes SL(2, \mathbb{C})$. For further details we refer to the exsisting literature [22], [20] and [30]. As discussed before, little groups and orbits of the Poincaré group are well known and in particular for a massive particle the orbit is the mass hyperboloid $SL(2, \mathbb{C})/SU(2) \sim \Re^3$ and a fixed point is given by the 4-vector $(m, 0, 0, 0)$. A representation for $SU(2)$ is the usual $2j + 1$-dimensional D^j and a global section (see appendix of [25]) for $SU(2)$ can be chosen remembering the (unique) polar decomposition for an element $g \in SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ given by $g = \rho u$ where ρ is a positive definite hermitian matrix and $u \in SU(2)$. Thus a section η can be written as:

$$\eta(\rho) = \eta(\rho[SU(2)]) = (\rho, 0). \tag{34}$$

This concludes the first two points in our construction; a canonical wave equation can be immediately written starting from (59) as:

$$U^{m,+,j}\,(g)\,f(gp) = e^{ip\cdot a} D^j[\rho^{-1}_{\Lambda_g \Lambda_p} \Lambda_g \rho_{\Lambda_p}] f(p), \tag{35}$$

where $g = (a, \Lambda)$, the exponential term is the character of $a \in T^4$, the $\cdot$ represents the Minkowskian internal product, p is a point over the orbit, U

is a representation of the little group over an Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_j$ and $f(p)$ is a function in $L^2(SL(2,\mathbb{C}) \ltimes N / SU(2) \ltimes N) \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$. Notice also that the representation is labelled by the $SU(2)$ quantum number j and by the indices $m, +$ that allow to select a unique point over the orbit through the identification $m = K$ and $sgn(K) > 0$.
The covariant wave equation can be written for functions $f(p) \in L^2(T^4) \otimes \mathcal{H}_\lambda$ as:

$$\left(U^\lambda(g) f\right)(a) = U_\lambda(\Lambda) f(\Lambda^{-1}(a - a')), \tag{36}$$

where $g = (a', \Lambda)$ and U_λ is a representation of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$. In the dual space (36) becomes:

$$\left(U^\lambda(g) \hat{f}\right)(p) = e^{ip\cdot a} U_\lambda(\Lambda) \hat{f}(\Lambda^{-1} p). \tag{37}$$

This concludes the fourth point of our construction; the reduction to the orbit of the $SU(2)$ little group can be achieved requiring the mass condition for each $\hat{f}(p)$:

$$\theta(p_0)(p^2 - m^2)\hat{f}(p) = 0,$$

which amounts to restrict [12] the measure $d^4(p)$ to $d\mu'(p) = 2\pi\delta(p^2 - m^2)\theta(p^0) d^4p$. This means that instead of dealing with functions in $L^2(T^4, d^4p) \otimes \mathcal{H}_\lambda$ we consider elements of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{m,+,\lambda} = L^2(T^4, d\mu'(p)) \otimes \mathcal{H}_\lambda$. In order to relate the canonical and the covariant wave equations, we introduce the operator

$$V = U_\lambda(\rho_p^{-1}),$$

where $\rho_p^{-1} = \eta(p)^{-1}$. This acts on functions as

$$(V\hat{f})(p) = U_\lambda\left(\rho_p^{-1}\right)\hat{f}(p).$$

Thus if we define the space $\mathcal{H}_\eta^{m,+,\lambda}$ to coincide as a vector space with $\mathcal{H}^{m,+,\lambda}$ but equipped with the inner product

$$(f, f')_\eta = \int d\mu'(p) \left(U_\lambda(\eta(p))^{-1} f(p), U_\lambda(\eta(p)^{-1}) f'(p)\right)_{\mathcal{H}_\lambda},$$

we see that the map V is indeed unitary and substituting it in (37) through $V^{-1} U^{m,+,\lambda} V = U_\eta^{m,+,\lambda}$ we get:

$$\left(U^{m,+,\lambda}(g) f\right)(p) = e^{i<\phi,a>} U_\lambda(\rho_p^{-1} \Lambda \rho_{\Lambda^{-1}p}) f(\Lambda^{-1}p), \tag{38}$$

which is coincident with the canonical wave equation even if U_λ is still a representation of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$. This means that in general our wave function has more components that those needed and for this reason, we have to introduce a suitable orthoprojection modding out the unwanted components. This can be done introducing a matrix π such that

---

[12] Here and in the following we denote with $'$ the measure restricted to the orbit.

$$\pi f(\bar{p}) = f(\bar{p}),$$

where $\bar{p}$ is a fixed point over the orbit. Another way to express the projection operation is to consider the point $f'(\bar{p}) = (U(\Lambda)f)(\bar{p})$ and the equation (38) in order to obtain the more familiar expression

$$\pi(p)f(p) = f(p),$$

where $p = L_{\Lambda}^{-1}\bar{p}$ and where $\pi(p) = D^{-1}(\Lambda)\pi D(\Lambda)$. Using the decomposition $\Lambda = \rho_p \gamma$ that we introduced in order to construct the section for the $SU(2)$-orbit and using the fact that π commutes with $D(\gamma)$ with $\gamma \in SU(2)$, then $\pi(p) = D^{-1}(\rho_p)\pi D(\rho_p)$; so we have that $\pi(p)$ transforms as a covariant matrix operator.

Let us consider explicitly the case of a massive particle with spin $\frac{1}{2}$; to preserve parity we consider the representation $D^{(\frac{1}{2},0)} \oplus D^{(0,\frac{1}{2})}$, the matrix π projecting away the unwanted components is:

$$\pi = diag[1,0,0,0] = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_0 + I),$$

where γ_0 is the usual Dirac's γ matrix. Using the covariant transformation of this matrix, we find that

$$(D^{(\frac{1}{2},0)} \oplus D^{(0,\frac{1}{2})})^{-1}(\Lambda_p)\pi \left(D^{(\frac{1}{2},0)} \oplus D^{(0,\frac{1}{2})}(\Lambda_p)\right) = \frac{1}{2m}(\gamma_\mu p^\mu + m),$$

where $p = L_\Lambda \bar{p}$ and where $\bar{p} = (m,0,0,0)$ is a fixed point in the $SU(2)$-orbit. Thus the equation $\pi(p)f(p) = f(p)$ for $f(p) \in L^2(\Re^3, d\mu(p)) \otimes \mathcal{H}_|$ becomes:

$$(\gamma_\mu p^\mu - m)f(p) = 0,$$

which is the well known Dirac equation. In a similar way we can find the well known equations for all $SU(2)$ spins.

Let us briefly remark that for massless particles the situation is more complicated since in this case we have to deal with the non compact $E(2)$ group. The representation of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ cannot be fully decomposed into representations of $E(2)$ and thus the orthoprojection condition has to be modified [29].

6.1 Wave equations for the BMS group

Recalling the discussion on representations of the previous Section we focus on the Hilbert topology case and derive the covariant wave equations for the little groups $SU(2), \Gamma, \Theta$ and finite groups.

The group SU(2)

Clearly the first point of the construction has already been given by McCarthy ([23], [25]) togheter with a partial classification of the orbits. For massive particles a great difference arises from the Poincaré group where the only orbit with $m > 0$ is the one of the $SU(2)$ little group whereas for the BMS group, apart from $SU(2)$, we need to consider more groups as it can be seen from the tables in the previous Section.

Let us now address point (2). Remember that in this case the orbit is isomorphic to $\Re^3$ and that a fixed point on the orbit is given by a constant function K over the sphere S^2. Thus the orbit is uniquely characterized by the mass $m^2 = K$ and the momentum 4-vector is given by $\pi(\phi) = (m, 0, 0, 0)$ where ϕ is a constant supertranslation. A section for the bundle $G\,(SL(2,\mathbb{C}) \ltimes N/SU(2) \ltimes N, \pi, SU(2) \ltimes N)$ has been given in the previous discussion on the Poincaré case through the polar decomposition $g = \rho u$ with $u \in SU(2)$ and ρ a positive definite hermitian matrix. Thus a section η can be written as:

$$\eta[p] = \eta[\rho SU(2)] = (\rho, 0)\,. \tag{39}$$

Point (3) is also easy to implement starting from the well known representations of $SU(2)$ since (59) becomes:

$$U^{m,+,j}\,(g)\,u(gp) = e^{i<\phi,a>} D^j[\rho^{-1}_{\Lambda_g\Lambda_p}\Lambda_g\rho_{\Lambda_p}]u(p), \tag{40}$$

where $g = (a, \Lambda) \in BMS$, the exponential term is the character of the supertranslations a expressed via the Riesz-Fischer theorem, p is a point over the orbit, U is a representation of the little group over an Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_j$ and $u(p)$ is a function in $L^2(SL(2,\mathbb{C}) \ltimes N/SU(2) \ltimes N) \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$.

After completing point (3), we can write the general covariant wave equation. In this case we deal with functions $f \in L^2(N) \otimes \mathcal{H}_\lambda$ (λ is index for an $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ representation) i.e.

$$\left(U^\lambda(g)f\right)(\phi) = U_\lambda(\Lambda)f(\Lambda^{-1}(\phi - \phi')), \tag{41}$$

where $g = (\phi', \Lambda)$ and U_λ is a representation of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$. We go to the dual space of supertranslations using the well defined character $\chi(\alpha)$ and functional integration restricting to the $SU(2)$ orbit to get for $\hat{f}(a) \in L^2(\hat{N}) \otimes \mathcal{H}_\lambda$.

$$\left(U^\lambda(g)\hat{f}\right)(a) = e^{i<\phi',a>} U_\lambda(\Lambda)\hat{f}(\Lambda^{-1}a), \tag{42}$$

Thus in the end we deal with functions in the Hilbert space $\hat{\mathcal{H}}^{m,+,\lambda} = L^2(N, d\mu') \otimes \mathcal{H}_\lambda$. The linear operator relating the induced and the covariant wave equations is given for a generic point in the orbit $p = (\phi, \Lambda)$ by

$$V = U_\lambda(\rho_p^{-1}),$$

where $\rho_p^{-1} = \eta(p)^{-1}$. This acts on functions as

$$(V\hat{f})(p) = U_\lambda\left(\rho_p^{-1}\right)\hat{f}(p).$$

Thus if we define the space $\mathcal{H}_\eta^{m,+,\lambda}$ to coincide as a vector space with $\mathcal{H}^{m,+,\lambda}$ but provided with the inner product

$$(f, f')_\eta = \int_{orbit} d\mu'(p) \left(U_\lambda(\eta(p))^{-1} f(p), U_\lambda(\eta(p)^{-1}) f'(p)\right)_{\mathcal{H}_\lambda},$$

we see that the map V is indeed unitary and substituting it in (42) through $V^{-1} U^{m,+,\lambda} V = U_\eta^{m,+,\lambda}$ we get:

$$\left(U^{m,+,\lambda}(g)f\right)(p) = e^{i<\phi,a>} U_\lambda(\rho_p^{-1}\Lambda\rho_{\Lambda^{-1}p}) f(\Lambda^{-1}p), \tag{43}$$

which is coincident with the canonical wave equation though U_λ is still a representation of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$.

The last point of our construction comes into play since we need to impose further constraints on the wave equation in order to mod out the unwanted components arising from the fact that U_λ is a representation of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ that has to be restricted to an $SU(2)$ one. This reduction can be expressed using a matrix π and, for the BMS group, the discussion for $SU(2)$ is exactly the same as in Poincaré; so if we choose a fixed point $\bar{\phi}$ in the orbit, the constraints we have to impose becomes:

$$\pi[SU(2)] f(\bar{\phi}) = f(\bar{\phi}). \tag{44}$$

Remembering that a representation $D^{(j_1,j_2)} \in SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ can be decomposed into SU(2) representations through $D^{(j_1,j_2)} = \bigoplus_{j=|j_1-j_2|}^{j_1+j_2} D^j$, the matrix π simply selects the desired value of j from the above decomposition. If, as an example, we consider the value $j = 1$ in the representation $D^{(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})} = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{1} D^j$, the matrix π is:

$$\pi[SU(2)] = diag[0, 1, 1, 1].$$

The group Γ

Consider now Γ, namely the double cover of $SO(2)$. An element of this group is given by a diagonal complex matrix:

$$g = \begin{bmatrix} e^{\frac{i}{2}t} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-\frac{i}{2}t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Again in [25] the orbits for this little group were studied and it was shown that both the squared mass and the sign of the energy are good labels. A fixed point on this orbit is given by a supertranslation depending only on the modulus of the complex coordinate over S^2 i.e. $\psi = \psi(\mid z \mid)$ (or equivalently in real coordinates this means that $\psi(\theta, \varphi)$ does not depends on ϕ).Thus in this case the projection over the four-momentum for the fixed point is

$$\pi(\psi(\theta, \varphi)) = (p_0, 0, 0, p_3).$$

Notice also that we choose in the orbit of Γ those functions not in the orbit of $SU(2)$-i.e. they cannot be transformed into a constant function; this means that any point in the orbit has the form $\psi = \Gamma\psi(\mid z \mid)$. In [23] also a section for the bundle $G(SL(2, \mathbb{C})/\Gamma, \pi, \Gamma)$ has been given: any element $g \in SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ can be decomposed as explained before as $g = \rho u$ with $u \in SU(2)$. The element u can further be decomposed as $u = \gamma_\phi \sigma_\theta \gamma_\psi$ which implies $g = \tau\gamma_\psi$ where now $\gamma_\psi \in \Gamma$. Thus a section can be written as:

$$\eta(\tau[\Gamma]) = (0, \tau) \in BMS.$$

This completes the first and the second point of the construction. The canonical wave equation can be written directly from the one-dimensional representation for Γ acting on an element γ as a multiplication in one complex dimension:

$$D^s(\gamma) = e^{ist}.$$

This leads to

$$U^{m,+,s,p_0}(g)f(gp) = e^{i<\phi,a>} D^s(\tau^{-1}_{\Lambda_g \Lambda_p} \Lambda_g \tau_{\Lambda_p}) f(p), \qquad (45)$$

where $g=(a,\Lambda)\in BMS$, $f(p)$ is a square integrable function over the orbit $SL(2,\mathbb{C})/\Gamma\sim\Re^3\times S^2$ and the indices on the left hand side label the orbit.

Notice that the difference from $SU(2)$ is that these indices are not uniquely determining the orbit since in that case the fixed point was given by the constant supertranslation $K=m$ and for this reason the value of the mass, and the sign of p_0 were fixing in a unique way the point over the orbit. On the other hand here the labels $m,+,p_0$ are fixing only a class of points with the same 4-momentum i.e. $p^\mu=(p_0,0,0,\sqrt{m^2+p_3^2})$ whereas the supertranslation associated is not unique since in real coordinates it has the form:

$$\phi(\theta)=p_0+p_3 cos\theta+h(\theta),$$

for all possible $h(\theta)$ Γ-invariants.

It also worth stressing that if we choose $p_0=m$ and $p_3=0$ (i.e. the equivalent of the rest frame), the associated supertranslation is not constant but it has the form $\phi(\theta)=K+h'(\theta)$ with $h'\neq 0$ since otherwise the point would belong to the $SU(2)$ orbit which is impossible. This can be seen as the impossibility to define ordinary angular momentum . More generally this is related to the statement [31] that the representations of BMS different from $SU(2)$ cannot be uniquely reduced to Poincaré ones but each of them decomposes into many differents Poincaré spins as recalled before.

Point (4) of our construction goes along similar lines just by reducing the functional integration to the corresponding orbit. Thus we only need to define the linear map for a generic point over the orbit $p=(a,\Lambda)$

$$V=U(\rho_p^{-1}),$$

where $\rho^{-1}(p)$ is the inverse of the section $\eta(p)$. As in the case of $SU(2)$ this linear operator switches from the space $\mathcal{H}^{m,+,p_0,s}=L^2(N,d\mu')\otimes\mathcal{H}_s$ to the space $\mathcal{H}_\eta^{m,+,p_0,s}$ which coincides as a vector space but the internal product is:

$$(\psi,\phi)_\eta=\int\limits_{\Re^3\times S^2} d\mu'(p)\left(U_\lambda(\eta(p)^{-1})\psi(p),U_\lambda(\eta(p)^{-1})\phi(p)\right)_{\mathcal{H}_s}.$$

As before substituting the map V into (42), we get:

$$\left(U^{m,+,p_0,\lambda}(g)f\right)(p)=e^{i<\phi,a>}U_\lambda(\tau_p^{-1}\Lambda\tau_{\Lambda^{-1}p})f(\Lambda^{-1}p), \qquad (46)$$

which is coincident with (45) except that the representation needs to be reduced from $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ to Γ. Since all little groups in the Hilbert topology are compact, we know that U is always completely reducible and that the desired irreducible component can be picked out.

As before we start from a representation $D^{(0,j)} \oplus D^{(j,0)}$ to make sense of parity and we impose restriction. Since the decomposition of $D^j(SU(2))$ into Γ is well known and has the form:

$$D^l(\Gamma) = \bigoplus_{m=-l}^{l} U^m(\Gamma),$$

we can first project from $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ into a representation of $SU(2)$ and using the above decomposition, select a particular value of s. The procedure is basically:

$$D^{(j_1,j_2)}(g) = \bigoplus_{j=|j_1-j_2|}^{j_1+j_2} D^j(g) = \bigoplus_{j=|j_1-j_2|}^{j_1+j_2} \bigoplus_{s=-j}^{j} D^s(g).$$

The subsidiary condition is:

$$\pi(\Gamma)f(\bar{\phi}) = f(\bar{\phi}),$$

where $\bar{\phi}$ is a fixed point over the orbit (i.e. $\bar{\phi} = p_0 + p_3 \cos\theta + h(\theta)$) and where $\pi(\Gamma)$ extracts from the above decomposition the desired s component. As an example in the case of $s = 1$ from the representation $D^{(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})}$ we know that:

$$D^{(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})} = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{1} D^j(g) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{1} \bigoplus_{s=-j}^{j} D^s(g),$$

so that

$$\pi = diag[0,0,0,1]$$

The group Θ

The third group we examine is the compact, non-connected little group $\Theta = \Gamma R_2$ where R_2 is the set (not the group) given by the matrix I and $J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. The orbit of this group is given by the points in the orbit of Γ which are also invariant under R_2. This last condition is equivalent to require for the supertranslation $\psi(\theta) = \psi(-\theta)$. Upon projection over the dual space this implies that $\pi(\psi) = p_0 + p_3 cos\theta = p_0$. Thus a fixed point under the action of Θ is an element of the orbit of Γ with the form

$$\psi(\theta) = p_0 + h(\theta),$$

with clearly $h(\theta) \neq 0$ since otherwise the supertranslation would be in the $SU(2)$ orbit.

Another important remark is that the orbit $SL(2,\mathbb{C})/\Theta$ is $\Re^3 \times P^2$ which is the same orbit of the group Γ plus the antipodal identification of the points over the sphere due to R_2. In order to choose a section we remember that every $g \in SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ can be decomposed as $g = \tau\gamma$ with $\gamma \in \Gamma$; a point in $SL(2,\mathbb{C})/\Gamma$ is thus identified with the value of τ. In our case a global section (see [25]) can be given noticing that every matrix $\sigma_\theta = \left[\begin{array}{cc} \cos\frac{\theta}{2} & i\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ i\sin\frac{\theta}{2} & \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \end{array}\right]$ can be decomposed as $\sigma_\theta = \sigma_{\theta'} q$ with $0 < \theta' < \frac{\pi}{2}$, $q = \gamma_{\frac{\pi}{2}} r \gamma_{-\frac{\pi}{2}}$ and $r \in R_2$. Since any element g of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ can be written as $g = \rho u = \rho\gamma_\Phi\sigma_\theta\gamma_\psi$, we can plug in the above decomposition

$$g = \rho\gamma_\Phi\sigma_{\theta'}q\gamma_\psi = \beta q'.$$

Thus we can see that a section $\omega : G/\Theta \to G$ is given by $\omega(g\Theta) = \omega(\lambda q'\Theta) = \omega(\lambda\Theta) = \lambda$. From this we can easily write a section $SL(2,\mathbb{C}) \ltimes N/\Theta \ltimes N \to SL(2,\mathbb{C}) \ltimes N$ as:

$$\eta(\beta) = (\beta, 0).$$

This concludes point (1) and (2) of the construction. Consider now Θ representations: the 1-dimensional one when $s = 0$ (s is the index for the representation of Γ) which is $U(\gamma) = 1$ and $U(J) = -1$ whereas for integer s we have:

$$U(\gamma_\phi) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} e^{\frac{i}{2}s\phi} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-\frac{i}{2}s\phi} \end{array}\right], \quad U(J) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 0 & (-)^s \\ 1 & 0 \end{array}\right].$$

Recalling that the for the orbit of Θ we can apply the same considerations and the same labels as for Γ except that in our case $p_3 = 0$ (and $p_0 = m$), we can write

$$U^{m,+,s}(\gamma_\theta)(g)f(gp) = e^{i<\phi,a>} D^s[\beta^{-1}_{\Lambda_g\Lambda_p}\Lambda_g\beta_{\Lambda_p}]f(p), \tag{47}$$

where here we denote with D^s the representation of Θ over an Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_s$ and thus the function $f(p)$ is in $\mathcal{H}^{m,+,s} = L^2(SL(2,\mathbb{C}) \ltimes N/\Theta \ltimes N) \otimes \mathcal{H}_s$. We proceed than as in the previous cases. We introduce the operator $V = U_s(\eta(\beta(p)^{-1}))$ that sends the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{m,+,s}$ to $\mathcal{H}^{m,+,s}_\eta$ which is coincident as a vector space to the first but it is endowed with the internal product:

$$(f, f')_\eta = \int\limits_{\Re^3 \times P^2} d\mu'(p) \left(U_\lambda(\eta(p))^{-1}f(p), U_\lambda(\eta(p)^{-1})f'(p)\right)_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

As usual substituting the map V into (42) we get:

$$\left(U^{m,+,\lambda}(g)f\right)(p) = e^{i<\phi,a>}U_\lambda(\beta_p^{-1}\Lambda\beta_{\Lambda^{-1}p})f(\Lambda_p^{-1}), \tag{48}$$

where $f(p) = (V\hat{f})(p)$ and U_λ is the restriction of U_λ from $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ to Θ. We now reduce U_λ and this is indeed possible since Θ is compact. This can be achieved as for the Γ case using the character formula (see [31]) and every single s appears exactly once in the decomposition of $SU(2)$. We proceed then as in the Γ situation with the exception that now the projection equation $\pi[\Theta]f(\bar{\phi}) = f(\bar{\phi})$ is applied to the supertranslations which are a fixed point over the orbit of the Θ group. The form of the matrix will indeed be the same.

Finite groups

Only finite dimensional groups have to be considered in the massive case. We shall address only the (double cover of the) cyclic group C_n as an example since all the others are similar cases.

The group $\tilde{C}_n$ is given by the diagonal matrices:

$$c_n = \begin{bmatrix} e^{\frac{\pi ik}{n}} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\frac{-\pi ik}{n}} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $1 \leq k \leq 2n$. The orbit for this group is constructed from a fix point which is given by those supertranslations satisfying the periodic condition $\psi(\theta,\varphi) = \psi(\theta,\varphi+\frac{2\pi}{n})$. Thus, a part from the case $n = 1$ which is trivial, the above condition tells us that the function $\psi(\theta,\varphi) = p_0 + p_3\cos\theta + k(\theta,\varphi)$ where $k(\theta,\varphi)$ is a pure supertranslation. Furthermore we can assign a global section to this orbit noticing that any element of Γ can be decomposed as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} e^{i\frac{t}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\frac{t}{2}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\frac{t'}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\frac{t'}{2}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\frac{\pi k}{n}} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\frac{\pi k}{n}} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $0 < t' < \frac{\pi}{n}$. Since any element g of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ can uniquely be written as $g = \tau\gamma_\theta$, we can plug in the above decomposition writing $g = \tau\gamma_{\theta'}c_k$. Thus $\omega(gC_n) = \omega(\tau\gamma_{\theta'}c_kC_n) = \omega(\alpha C_n) = \alpha$. This concludes both points (1) and (2) of our construction. The representation is simply one dimensional and gives $D^k(g) = e^{\frac{ik\pi}{n}}$ with $1 \leq k \leq 2n$. Thus the canonical wave equation is simply:

$$U^{m,+,p_0,k}(g)f(gp) = e^{i<\phi,a>}D^k[\alpha^{-1}_{\Lambda_g\Lambda_p}\Lambda_g\alpha_{\Lambda_p}]f(p), \tag{49}$$

where as usual $g = (a, \Lambda)$, p is a point over the orbit and $f(p) \in L^2(SL(2, \mathbb{C} \ltimes N/C_n \ltimes N) \otimes \mathcal{H}_k$. The operator relating the two description is as usual $V = U_\lambda(\eta_p^{-1})$ that acting on functions over $\mathcal{H}^{m,+,p_0,\lambda} = L^2(N, d\mu') \otimes \mathcal{H}_\lambda$ as:

$$(V\hat{f})(p) = U_\lambda\left(\eta^{-1}(p)\right)\hat{f}(p).$$

Thus V sends the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{m,+,p_0,s}$ into $\mathcal{H}_\eta^{m,+,p_0,s}$ which are coincident as vector spaces but the latter is endowed with the inner product:

$$(f, f')_\eta = \int\limits_{\Re^3 \times \frac{P^3}{C_n}} d\mu' \left(U_\lambda(\eta(p)^{-1})f(p), U_\lambda(\eta(p)^{-1})f'(p)\right)_{\mathcal{H}_\lambda}.$$

Substituting the map V into (43), we get

$$\left(U^{m,+,p_0,\lambda} f\right)(p) = e^{i<\phi,a>} U_\lambda(\alpha_p^{-1}\Lambda\alpha_{\Lambda_p^{-1}}) f(\Lambda^{-1}p), \tag{50}$$

which is as usual coincident with (49) except for the fact that we need some further constraints to select the rep we like. In this case we can start from a representation of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ and progressively reduce it first to $SU(2)$ then to Γ and in the end to C_n. Following [31] we only need to consider the reduction of a representation D^s of Γ. Since on an element $c_n \in C_n$ D^s acts giving $e^{\frac{i\pi s}{n}}$ whereas the representation of D^k of C_n gives $e^{\frac{i\pi k}{n}}$; thus the representation of C_n appears only one or no times in D^s. This condition is expressed by the equation $s = \frac{k}{2}(mod\, n)$. From this we can see that

$$D^{(j_1,j_2)}(g) = \bigoplus_{j=|j_1-j_2|}^{j_1+j_2} \bigoplus_{s=-j}^{j} \delta_{s,\frac{k}{2}(mod\, n)} D^k(g).$$

We can easily now extract the orthoprojection matrix π and write the additional conditions

$$\pi[C_n]f(\bar{\phi}) = f(\bar{\phi}),$$

where $\bar{\phi}$ is a fixed point over the orbit of the C_n group. As an example let us consider the case $k = 0$ for C_2 in the representation $D^{(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})}$. We find from the decomposition that the $U^0(C_2)$ can appear only when the equation $0 = \frac{p}{2}(mod 2)$ holds; since p ranges only from -1 to 1, this implies that the desired representation appears only once in each $D^0(\Gamma)$.Thus

$$\pi[C_2] = diag[1, 0, 1, 0].$$

This concludes our analysis for the massless case and also for the massive case, since all other discrete groups in the Hilbert topology are acting like the cyclic.

6.2 Generalizations of the BMS group and possible extensions of the results

A natural question arising both from the representation theory and wave equations concerns the origin and meaning of discrete little groups. A suggestion comes from [32] where McCarthy studies all possible generalizations (42 at the end) of the BMS group. Among them one finds $N(S) \ltimes L_+$ where L_+ is the usual (connected component of the homogeneous) Lorentz group and $N(S)$ is the set of C^∞ scalar functions ("supertranslations" this time defined on a hyperboloyd and depending on three angular coordinates) from $S = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{3,1} \mid x \cdot x < 0\right\}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. This group is isomorphic to the *Spi group* identified by Ashtekar and Hansen [33] as the asymptotic symmetry group of spatial infinity i_0 in asymptotically flat space-times. The study of the representations for this group as well as for all others BMS-type groups can be carried on exactly along the lines of the original BMS. Thus we have still a freedom on the choice of topology for the "supertranslation" subgroup and wave equations can be in principle derived exactly in the same way as we did in the previous sections. Furthermore this suggests that a candidate field theory living on i_0 with fields carrying representations of *Spi*, should display, as well as the theory on $\Im^{\pm}$, a high degree of non locality this time with even more degeneracy since three instead of two angular coordinates define supertranslations.

Finally McCarthy also identified the euclidean BMS and the complexification of the BMS group[13]; the study of representations for these groups endowed with Hilbert topology gives rise to discrete groups and it has been suggested to relate them to the parametrization of the gravitational instantons moduli space.

7 Implications for the holographic mapping

7.1 Identifying boundary degrees of freedom

As we have seen in the previous analysis wave functions appearing in covariant and canonical wave equations are functions of the supertranslations or in dual terms of supermomenta. We have therefore a huge degree on non locality, the fields depending on an enormous (actually infinite) number of parameters entering into the expansions of supertranslations (supermomenta) on the 2-spheres.

---

[13] The euclidean BMS is the semidirect product of $N(\mathbb{R}^4 - \{0\})$ with $SO(4)$ whereas the complexification of BMS is given by the semidirect product of the complexified Lorentz group $\mathbb{C}SO(3,1)$ with the space of scalar functions from $\mathcal{N} = \left\{x \in \mathbb{C}^4 \mid x \cdot x = 0,\ \ x \neq 0\right\}$ to $\mathbb{C}$.

In addition their fluctuations are supposed to spread out on a degenerate manifold at null infinity. Recall also that supertranslations act along the u direction and are punctual transformations, with u playing the role of an affine parameter. Because of the difficulties in defining a theory on a degenerate manifold we find therefore more natural to place these fields and the putative boundary dynamics on the so called cone space [12], the space of smooth cross sections on $\Im$. The BMS group is thus interpreted as the group of mappings of the cone space onto itself.

We can give a pictorial description as follows: fix a two sphere section on $\Im$ and associate with this a point in the cone space calling this the origin. Any other point in the cone space will correspond to another two sphere section on $\Im$ and can be obtained by moving an affine distance $u = \alpha(\theta, \phi)$ along the original $\Im$. In this way points on cone space are mapped one to one to cross sections on $\Im$.

Therefore the holographic data ought to be encoded[14] on the set of 2-spheres and these in turn are mapped to points in cone space; we think then the candidate holographic description living in an abstract space, implying at the end of the day that holography should be simply an equivalence of bulk amplitudes with those derived from the boundary theory.[15]

An interesting consequence of working in the cone space is that one has in principle a way to define a length and therefore separate, in some sense, the spheres S^2 along null infinity. One can actually choose coordinates on the cone space: they will be the coefficients entering in the expansion of supertranslations in spherical harmonics. One can then show that there exsists an affine structure (infinite dimensional) on the cone space and eventually define a length for vectors in the cone space [12]

$$L^2 = [\int d\Omega(\alpha(\theta, \phi))^{-2}]^{-1} \tag{51}$$

This should allow to define [36] a sort of “cutoff”, a concept otherwise absent on the original degenerate $\Im$. In the case of AdS/CFT the dual theory is a CFT with no fundamental scale. There, however, one uses the fact that AdS is basically a "cylinder" to end up with the correct counting from both sides [38].

---

[14] See [34] for a similar considerations despite differences in the choice of screens.

[15] The situation can be compared to the BMN [35] limit of AdS/CFT, where the boundary of a pp-wave background is a null one dimensional line and geometrical interpretation seems difficult (and may be lacking). Again holography seems to be thought as an equivalence between bulk/boundary amplitudes, the latter may be living in some smaller CFT.

This goes along the direction suggested by Bousso in [37]. Actually apart from the special AdS case where one can show that, moving the boundary-screen to infinity, the boundary theory is indeed dual since it contains no more than one degree of freedom per Planck area [38], the "dual theory" approach should not work in our case and one should expect theories with a *changing* number of degrees of freedom in the case of null boundaries. Degrees of freedom should appear and disappear continuously[16]. The dependence of (51) on the coefficients tells us that a possible cut off length can change according to the number of coefficients we switch on-off. In turn we have seen that again $\alpha(\theta, \phi)$ enters in the changing of asymptotic shears and we have related the possibility of more/less bulk production according to the vanishing of asymptotic shear.

Interestingly, more/less bulk entropy will have at the end of the day effect on the way one defines lengths on the cone space.

7.2 Similarities with 't Hooft S-matrix Ansatz for black holes

The final picture one gets is quite similar to the scenario proposed by 't Hooft [39] in the context of black holes. In this case we have sort of holographic fields living on the horizon of the black hole. Time reversal symmetry is required and therefore one has operators living on the future and past horizons.

The description is given in first quantized set up and the degree of non locality is eventually expressed in the operator algebra at the horizon

$$[u(\Omega), v(\Omega')] = i f(\Omega - \Omega') \tag{52}$$

where $u(\Omega), v(\Omega)$ are the holographic fields living on the future/past horizon depending on the angular coordinates Ω and $f(\Omega, \Omega')$ is the Green function of the Laplacian operator acting on the angular horizon coordinates. Clearly the algebra is non local.

In this case too the angular coordinates are at the end of the day responsible for the counting of the degrees of freedom, even if 't Hooft S-matrix Ansatz is derived in a sort of eikonal limit assuming therefore a resolution bigger than Planck scale in the angular coordinates.

The Green function $f(\Omega, \Omega')$ tells us how to move on the granular structure living on the horizon and it is similar to our supertranslations generated indeed by $P_{lm} = Y_{lm}(\Omega)\partial_u$. The holographic information is therefore spread out in both cases on angular coordinates.

---

[16] We thank G.'t Hooft for stressing this point also in cosmological context

Going then to a second quantized description of 't Hooft formalism, fields are expected to be functional of $u(\Omega)$ and $v(\Omega)$, pretty much in the same way of our case. A proposal of 't Hooft (for the 2+1 dimensional case) preserving covariance is indeed

$$\phi \sim \sum_{orderings} \int d\Omega \left(\delta(x^1(\Omega) - x)\delta(x^2(\Omega) - y)\delta(x^0(\Omega) - t)\right) \tag{53}$$

where fields are functionals of coordinates in turn depending on the angles. Of course the horizon itself is a very special null surface and the set up is different, since the whole 't Hooft picture is dynamically generated in a holographic reduction taking place in a sort of WKB limit. At the end of the day, however, angular coordinates and their resolutions are the basis for the book-keeping of states.

The horizon itself is a sort of computer storing-transmitting information. One looses in a sense the notion of time evolution. This suggests that also in our case (recall that u acts via point transformations) the fields we have constructed are not quite required to evolve but are independent data living on the 2-spheres. What generates the dynamics should be a S-matrix in the spirit of 't Hooft. In this sense, the states are indeed holographic, since contain all bulk information.

7.3 Remarks on the construction of a S-matrix

Therefore, in analogy with 't Hooft scenario, we could imagine [36] a S-matrix with in and out states living on the respective cone spaces corresponding to $\Im^+$ and $\Im^-$ with fields carrying BMS labels. Of course the big task is to explicitly construct such a mapping.[17]

However, the motivation for a S-matrix is also due to the fact that in the asymptotically flat case we have problems with massive states which can change the geometry at infinity. In the case of AdS/CFT correspondence, on the other hand, it is true that one has a sort of box with walls at infinity so that quantization of modes is similar to fields in a cavity. But via the Kaluza-Klein mechanism one generates a confining potential for massive modes. Note also that already for massless fields the scattering problem in the physical spacetime can be translated in a characteristic initial value problem [40] at null infinity in the unphysical spacetime.[18]

---

[17] One should also may be take into account the role of spatial infinity in gluing the past and the future null infinities.

The way in which one should proceed in quantizing has to be different from the usual one, since one does not need choices of polarizations to kill unwanted phase space "volume". This has already been pointed out in [41] discussing BMS representations and therefore is automatically induced to fields carrying BMS representations we have constructed.

The choice of Hilbert topology, as already remarked, should be associated with bounded sources in the bulk, while the nuclear one should correspond to unbounded systems. In order to accommodate the unbounded systems which ought to correspond to scattering states, one should however define a proper notion of conformal infinity for unbounded states and this seems a difficult problem. Note however that to have a unitary S-matrix in a candidate holographic theory one *must* include unbounded states into the Hilbert space, otherwise asymptotic completeness [42] is violated.

In [24] it was also suggested to take a finer topology than the nuclear one because of the freedom in the topology choice for the supertranslations. It was proposed to use real analytitc functions enlarging therefore supermomenta to real hyperfunctions on the sphere. Interestingly quantum field theories in which fields are smeared by hyperfunctions show a non local behaviour and the density of states can have a non polynomial growth. This might in principle allow to recover bulk locality[19] although one should consider hyperfunctional solutions to the Einstein's equations. Moreover, if one assumes that the high energy behaviour of the density of states in the bulk is dominated by black holes, the exponential growth of states which suggests an intrinsic degree of non locality might be explained by working with hyperfunctions. This is again in sharp contrast with the asymptotically AdS case where the black hole density of states grows essentially like the entropy of a CFT [44].

8 Concluding remarks

Previous considerations show that holography in asymptotically flat spacetimes is in principle quite different from the usual paradigm in which we are expected to project information following bulk propagation.

---

[18] [40] contains a derivation of the Hawking effect and an interesting discussion on the BMS group. The main point is that one can have in any case an unambiguous definition of positive/negative frequencies and this is what matters for the Hawking particle production. Recall however that there ones refers to fields and their asymptotics in the bulk, not to fields carrying BMS representations as the ones we have derived.

[19] See [43] for similar considerations even if from a different point of view.

We have seen the relation between bulk entropy production and boundary symmetries and the nature of the fields carrying BMS representations. We have then suggested a possible way to encode bulk data. An equally interesting possibility to construct a model which realizes the BMS is to start from AdS/CFT and isolate a "flat space region" inside AdS. It follows then that the sector of the dual theory that appears to describe this would be the deep infrared, namely the uniform modes, or a matrix model in the case of the SYM dual to AdS.[20]

This does not mean that holography does not work but it seems likely it has to be thought in more general terms as an identity between theories living in different dimensions and this point of view has already been adopted in various contexts. After all the picture of light rays propagation is classical and (near) BPS D-branes and their charges “prefer” AdS in the large N double scaling limit corresponding to classical supergravity.

One might of course think as often done about topological phases of gravity, reabsorbing in such a way the infinite number of parameter due to non renormabizability in a topological field and pushing then in a natural way degrees of freedom to the boundary. However gauge non invariant excitations seems to be the relevant ones in the usual picture of physics we have and the phase transition from the topological phase seems quite difficult to explain. Formulating a holographic description in asymptotically flat spacetimes remains then a challenging and very open problem.

Acknowledgments

We thank G. ’t Hooft, M. Trigiante and M. Carfora for discussions and useful comments. C.D. thanks R. Loll and Spinoza Institute for hospitality during the realization of this work. The work of G.A. is supported in part by the European Community’s Human Potential Programme under contract HPRN-CT-2000-00131 Quantum Spacetime.

A Induced representations for semidirect product groups

We review in the following the theory of induced representations for semidirect product groups. Notations and conventions are those of [21].

---

[20] The appearance of a Matrix model in the BFSS dual to M-theory also suggests a matrix model dual to flat space. We thank the referee for this remark.

Choose a locally compact group G and a closed subgroup $K \subset G$ whose unitary representations $\sigma : K \to U(M)$ on a Hilbert space M are known. On the topological product $G \times V$, define an equivalence relation

$$(gk, v) \sim (g, \sigma(k)v) \quad \forall k \in K,$$

and the natural map

$$\pi : G \times_K V \to G/K, \tag{54}$$

assigning to equivalence classes $[g, k]$ the element gK on the coset G/K. The structure given in (54) is clearly the one of a fiber bundle where the generic fiber over a base point ($\pi^{-1}(gK) = \{[g, v]\}$) uniquely determines the element $v \in M$. This bijection gives to $\pi^{-1}(gK)$ the structure of a Hilbert space[21].

One can also introduce then a *Hilbert G-bundle* which is a Hilbert bundle as before with the action of a group G on both X, Y such that the map

$$\alpha_g : x \longrightarrow gx, \quad \beta_g : y \longrightarrow gy$$

is a Hilbert bundle automorphism for each group element.
Choose then a unique invariant measure class on the space G/K defined as above-i.e. for any $g \in G$, for any Borel set E and for a given measure μ also $\mu_g(E) = \mu(g^{-1}E)$ is a measure in the same class. It can be extended to any G-Hilbert bundle $\zeta = (\pi : X \to Y)$ where G is a topological group; besides given the Hilbert inner product on a fiber $\pi^{-1}(p)$ and an invariant measure class μ we can introduce

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ \psi \mid \psi \ \ a\ Borel\ section\ of\ the\ bundle, \int\limits_Y < \psi(p), \psi(p) > d\mu(p) < \infty \right\}.$$

A unitary G-action on $\mathcal{H}$ is given by:

$$(g\psi)(p) = \sqrt{\frac{d\mu_g}{d\mu}(p)}\, g(\psi(g^{-1} \cdot p)), \quad \forall p \in Y.$$

This action is also a representation of G on $\mathcal{H}$ and does not depend on the measure μ. Moreover this construction grants us that for any G-Hilbert bundle $\zeta_\sigma = (\pi : G \times_K V \to G/K)$ defined by a locally compact group G and by a K-representation σ, it is possible to derive an *induced representation* $T(\zeta_\sigma)$ which basically tells us that from any representation σ of K we can de facto induce a representation T to G. Consider now a group G which contains an abelian normal subgroup N. If we choose a subgroup H such that the map $N \times H$ is bijective, we can show that there exists an isomorphism between G and the semidirect product of $N \ltimes H$.

---

[21] A Hilbert bundle is defined as $\pi : X \to Y$ where both X, Y are topological spaces and a structure of a Hilbert space is given to $\pi^{-1}(p)$ for each $p \in Y$.

A character of N is a continuous homomorphism

$$\chi : N \longrightarrow U(1). \tag{55}$$

The set of all these maps forms an abelian group called the *dual group*:

$$\hat{N} = \{\chi \mid (\chi_1\chi_2)(n) = \chi_1(n)\chi_2(n)\}$$

Define then a G-action ($G \sim N \ltimes H$) onto the dual space induced from $G \times N \to N$ letting $(g, n) \to g^{-1}ng$ such that

$$G \times \hat{N} \to \hat{N}$$

gives $g\chi(n) = \chi(g^{-1}ng)$. Thus for any element $\chi \in \hat{N}$, one can define the *orbit* of the character as:

$$G\chi = \{g\chi \ \mid \ g \in G\},$$

and the *isotropy group* of a character under the G-action as:

$$G_\chi = \{g \ \mid \ g \in G, \ \ g\chi = \chi\}.$$

Clearly the set G_χ is never empty due to the fact that N acts trivially onto a character. Introduce now $L_\chi = H \cap G_\chi$, then

$$G_\chi = N \ltimes L_\chi.$$

The group L_χ is called the *little group* of χ and it is the isotropy group of the character χ under the action of the subgroup $H \subset G$.

Consider now a unitary representation σ for the little group L_χ acting on a vector space V. Then the map

$$\chi\sigma : N \times V \to U(N \times V),$$

such that $(n, v) \to \chi(n)\sigma(v)$, is a unitary representation of G_χ on the vector space V. So one can introduce an Hilbert G-bundle $\pi : G \times_{G_\chi} V \to G/G_\chi$ with a base space isomorphic to the space of orbits $G\chi$ defined for every representation $\chi\sigma$. One finally has [45]:

Theorem 1 (Mackey) *Let $G = N \ltimes H$ be a semidirect group as above and suppose that $\hat{N}$ contains a Borel subset meeting each orbit in $\hat{N}$ in just one point. Then*

- *The representation $T(\zeta)$ induced by the bundle $\pi : G \times_{G_\chi} V \to G/G_\chi$ is an irrep of $G \sim N \ltimes H$ for any χ and for any σ.*
- *each irrep of G is equivalent to a representation $T(\zeta)$ as above with the orbit $G\chi$ uniquely determined and σ determined only up to equivalence.*

A.1 BMS representations in Hilbert topology

We endow the supertranslation group with an Hilbert inner product:

$$< \alpha, \beta >= \int_{S^2} \alpha(x)\beta(x) d\Omega; \tag{56}$$

where $x \in S^2$, and the supertranslations α, β are scalar maps $S^2 \to \Re$. Therefore $N = L^2(S^2)$ is an abelian topological group.

Any element α in the supertranslation group can be decomposed as:

$$\alpha(\theta, \phi) = \sum_{l,m} \alpha_{lm} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi).$$

This decomposition is topology independent but in the case we are considering the complex coefficients α_{lm} have to satisfy

$$\bar{\alpha}_{lm} = (-)^m \alpha_{l,-m}.$$

Notice that supertranslations admit a natural decomposition into the direct sum of two orthogonal (under the Hilbert space internal product) subspaces (i.e. subgroups): translations and proper supertranslations. In particular, for any $\alpha(\theta, \phi) \in L^2(S^2)$, one can write $\alpha = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1$ with:

$$\alpha_0 = \sum_{l=0}^{1} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} \alpha_{lm} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi), \quad \alpha_1 = \sum_{l>1} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} \alpha_{lm} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi).$$

Thus N can be written as:

$$N \sim A \oplus B,$$

where A is the translation group and $B = N - A$. One has however to keep in mind that this decomposition, as an isomorphism, is not preserved under the action of the $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ group.

Consider the dual of the supertranslation space, the character space $\hat{N}$ whose elements can be written exploiting the Reisz-Fischer theorem for Hilbert spaces as:

$$\chi \in \hat{N} \Longrightarrow \chi(\alpha) = e^{i<\phi,\alpha>},$$

where $\phi \in N$ is uniquely determined. The G-action on $\hat{N}$ is defined as the map $G \times \hat{N} \to \hat{N}$ sending the pair (g, χ) to $g\chi(\alpha) = \chi(g^{-1}(\alpha))$; instead from the point of view of an element $\phi \in N$, the action $G \times N \to N$ is:

$$g\phi(z, \bar{z}) = K_g^{-3}(z, \bar{z})\phi(gz, g\bar{z}).$$

The above relation tells us that the dual space $\hat{N}$ is isomorphic to the supertranslations space N and there exists a decomposition of $\hat{N}$ as a direct sum of two subgroups-i.e. $\hat{N} = A_0 \oplus B_0$, where A_0 is (isomorphic to) the space of linear functionals vanishing on A whereas B_0 is the space of linear functionals vanishing on B_0. This means that A_0 is composed by those character mapping all the elements of A into the unit number and the same holds also for B_0. As in the supertranslation case, this decomposition is only true at the level of vector fields since it is not G-invariant. The only space which is not changing under group transformations is the subspace A_0.

Since one can associate a unique element of N, namely ϕ to each $\chi(\alpha)$ one can also decompose this field as:

$$\phi(\theta, \phi) = \sum_{l=0}^{1} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} p_{lm} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi) + \sum_{l>1} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} p_{lm} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi),$$

where the first piece in the sum is in one to one correspondence with the quadruplet (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) which can be thought as the components of a momentum vector related to the Poincaré group. For this reason one can introduce a new space A' isomorphic both to A and $\hat{A}$ which is given by the set of all possible functions ϕ and which is often referred as the supermomentum space.

One can now find representations of the BMS group in Hilbert topology with the help of Mackey's theorem applying it to this infinite dimensional (Hilbert)-Lie group in the spirit of [23]. The first step consists in finding the orbits of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ in $\hat{N}$ which are homogeneous spaces that can be classified as the elements of the set of non conjugate subgroups of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$. In order to find a representation for the BMS group, after classifying the homogeneous spaces M, we shall find a character χ_0 fixed under M and then identify each M with its little group associated with the orbit $G\chi_0 \sim G/L$.

As a starting point we shall consider only connected subgroups of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$. The list of these groups is well known but most of them do not admit a non trivial fixed point in N. This request restricts them to

Little group	Character	Fixed point	Orbit
$SU(2)$	$\chi(\alpha) = e^{i<K,\alpha>}$	$\phi(\theta,\varphi) = K$	$PSL(2,\mathbb{C})$
Γ	$\chi(\alpha) = e^{i<\zeta(\|z\|),\alpha>}$	$\zeta(\| z \|)$	G/Γ
Z_2	$\chi(\alpha) = e^{i<\phi_0(z,\bar{z}),\alpha>}$	$\phi_0(z,\bar{z})$	$G/SU(2)$

where Γ, which consists of diagonal matrices, is the double cover of $SO(2)$ and where Z_2 is not formally a connected group but nonetheless it is the center of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ and for this reason it acts in a trivial way.

At this point one needs to express explicitly the induced representations; this operation consists in giving a unitary irrep U of L_χ on a suitable Hilbert space H for any little group and a G-invariant measure on the orbit of each little group. For the connected subgroups, one has [23]:

- the group Z_2 has only two unitary irreps, the identity D^0 and a second faithful representation D^1 both acting on the Hilbert space of complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$ as:
$$D^0(\pm I) = 1, \quad D^1(\pm I) = \pm 1.$$
- the unitary irreps of $\Gamma(\sim \pi\frac{R}{4}Z)$ are instead indexed by an integer or half integer number s acting on the Hilbert space of complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$ as:
$$D^s(g) = e^{ist},$$
where $g \in \Gamma$ and
$$g = \begin{bmatrix} e^{\frac{it}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\frac{-it}{2}} \end{bmatrix}.$$
- the unitary irreps of $SU(2)$ are the usual ones acting on a $2j+1$ dimensional complex Hilbert space with $j \in \frac{Z}{2}$.

Consider now the case of non connected little groups; the hope is that all these groups are compact since this grants us that their representations can be labelled only by finite indices. For the BMS group in the Hilbert topology this is indeed the case since it was shown in [25] (see theorem 1) that all little groups are compact. Besides, since the homogeneous Lorentz group admits $SO(3)$ as maximal compact subroup, we need to analyse only subgroups of $SO(3)$. The list of these subgroups has been in [25]:

$$C_n \quad D_n \quad T \sim A_4 \quad O \sim S_4 \quad I \sim A_5 \quad \Theta = \Gamma R_2,$$

where $R_2 = \left\{ I, J = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{array} \right] \right\}$. It shows that we are dealing only with groups with finite dimensional representations which means that there are no continuous indices labelling states invariant under BMS group with Hilbert topology.

As in the usual approach, one can then construct on each orbit a constant function, namely the Casimir, in order to classify them. Instead of working on $\hat{N}$ it is easier to consider the space of scalar functions N' isomorphic to $\hat{N}$ and endow it with a bilinear application assigning to the pair (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) the number $B(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \pi(\phi_1) \cdot \pi(\phi_2)$ where π is the projection on the momentum components (i.e. $\pi : N' \to A'$) and the dot denotes the usual Lorentz inner product. It is also straightforward to see that the bilinear application is G-invariant.

This last property implies that on each orbit in $\hat{N}$, the function B is constant and its value can be calculated since $\pi(\phi) = (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3)$ so that:

$$B(\phi, \phi) = \pi(\phi) \cdot \pi(\phi) = m^2.$$

One can thus label each orbit in the character space with an invariant, the squared mass, together with the sign of the "temporal" component i.e. $sgn(p_0)$. These invariants grant only a partial classification since, for example, in the case of unfaithful representations, $\pi(\phi) = 0$, which implies that the above invariants are trivial. For faithful representations too, we cannot conclude that the classification is complete since different orbits can correspond to the same value for the mass. One can also find a constant number to label the orbits corresponding to unfaithful representations-i.e. an bilinear invariant application mapping at least A^0 to real numbers. This has been done in [25]:

$$Q^2 = \pi^2 \int \int \frac{\mid z_1 - z_2 \mid^2 \ln \mid z_1 - z_2 \mid}{(1+ \mid z_1 \mid^2)(1+ \mid z_2 \mid^2)} \phi(z_1, \bar{z}_1) \phi(z_2, \bar{z}_2) d\mu(z_1, \bar{z}_1) d\mu(z_2, \bar{z}_2), \tag{57}$$

where ϕ is a function of class $C^\infty(S^2)$. Thus Q^2 is defined only for a subset dense in the Hilbert space $L^2(S^2)$ which from the physical point of view makes no difference.

A.2 BMS representations in nuclear topology

The study of BMS group to label elementary particles started with the hope to remove the difficulty with the Poincaré group concerning the continuous representations associated to the non compact $E(2)$ subgroup. Unfortunately, continuous representations appear if one chooses for the supertranslations a different topology (for istance $C^k(S^2)$). This was for the first time pointed out in [28] where it was shown that also non compact little groups appear (for instance $E(2)$).

Nonetheless it is worth studying representations for the BMS group with N endowed with the topology $C^\infty(S^2)$. In this case the action of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ on the space of supertranslations is given by a representation T equivalent to the irrep of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ on the space $D_{(2,2)}$ introduced by Gel'fand. This implies that we have to use techniques proper of *rigged* Hilbert spaces.

The main object we shall deal with is $D_{(n,n)}$ which is the space of functions $f(z,\omega)$ of class C^∞ except at most in the origin. These functions also satisfy the relation $f(\sigma z, \sigma w) = \mid \sigma \mid^{(2n-2)} f(z,w)$ for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$. At the end of the day, one has the following chain of isomorphisms

$$BMS = N \ltimes G \longleftrightarrow D_{(2,2)} \ltimes G \longleftrightarrow D_2 \ltimes G,$$

where D_2 is the space of C^∞ functions $\zeta(z)$ depending on a single complex variable such that any element $g(z,w) \in D_{(2,2)}$ can be written as $g(z,w) = \mid z \mid^2 \zeta(z_1) = \mid w \mid^2 \hat{\zeta}(z_1)$ with $z_1 = \frac{w}{z}$ and $\hat{\zeta}(z_1) = \mid z_1 \mid^2 \zeta(z_1^{-1})$.

Irreducible representation can arise (see theorem 2 in [24]) can arise either from a transitive G action in the supermomentum space or from a cylinder measure μ with respect to the G action is strictly ergodic i.e. for every measurable set $X \subset N'$ $\mu(X) = 0$ or $\mu(N' - X) = 0$ and μ is not concentrated on a single G-orbit in N'.

The first step is to classify all little groups; they can either be discrete subgroups, non-connected non discrete Lie subgroups and connected Lie subgroups.

Discrete subgroups can be derived exactly as in the Hilbert case and so the only connected little groups for the BMS group are:

$$SU(2), \;\; \Gamma, \;\; \Delta, \;\; SL(2,\mathbb{R}).$$

Here one can point out the first difference between the Hilbert and the nuclear topology which consists in the appearance of the $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ little group which will contribute only to unfaithful representations.

Non connected non discrete subgroups S can be derived using still theorem 5 in [24] since each S is a subgroup of the normalizer $N(S_0)$ where S_0 is the identity component of S. Here is the list:

- S_1 which is the set of matrices

$$\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^r & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma^r \end{bmatrix} \text{with } \sigma = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}, \;\; 0 \leq r \leq (n-1) \right\},$$

- S_2 which is the set of matrices

$$\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} e^{qr} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-qr} \end{bmatrix} \text{where q is a fixed non negative number and r is an integer} \right\},$$

- S_3 which is the set of matrices

$$\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} z_1^r z_2^s & 0 \\ 0 & z_1^{-r} z_2^{-s} \end{bmatrix} \text{where } z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and r, s are integers,} \right\},$$

- S_4 which is the set of matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & r \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

To establish the faithfulness of the irreps, one needs to calculate the projection on the supermomentum space of supertranslation:

$$\pi(\phi)(z') = \frac{i}{2} \int dz d\bar{z} (z - z')(\bar{z} - \bar{z'}) \phi(z) \neq 0.$$

The only connected groups occuring as little group for faithful representations are $\Gamma, \Delta, SU(2)$ with vanishing square mass 0. It is also interesting to notice that the orbit invariant Q^2 defined for the Hilbert topology for unfaithful representations is not available in the nuclear topology since it is not defined for distributional supermomenta. Finally no information is available about discrete subgroups since it very difficult to classify them above all for infinite discrete subgroups. This means that the study of BMS representations in the nuclear topology has to be completed yet.

B Wave equations in fiber bundle approach

We are going to briefly review in the following definitions and notations used in the derivations of the BMS wave equations following [29]. As said we use sort of diagrams to facilitate the reader even if they are not rigorous mathematically speaking.

Consider then

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P(H,M) \arrow[r, dashed, "\sigma"] \arrow[d, "\pi"] & GL(V) \arrow[d, dashed, "*"] \\
M & E(M,V) \arrow[l, "\pi_E"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

In our case $P(H,M)$ is a group G and a principal bundle whose fiber H is a closed subgroup of G and whose base space is the homogeneous space given by the coset G/H; each linear representation $\sigma : H \to GL(V)$ automatically defines the vector bundle (that's the reason why we used the dotted lines) $E(M,V) = P \times_H V$ whose generic element is the equivalence class $[u,a]$ with $u \in P$ and $a \in V$. The equivalence relation defining this class is given by $(u,a) \sim (uu',a) = (u, \sigma(u')a)$.

One defines than a G-action; in particular on $P = G$ it is the obvious one i.e. $g(uh) = (gu)h$ whereas on M the action is induced through the projection π as $g\pi(u) = \pi(gu)$. Finally on the E bundle the G-action is $g[u,a] = [gu,a]$. i if we consider a generic section for the E bundle i.e. $\psi : M \to E(M,V)$, we can act on it through a linear representation of G as:

$$(U(g)\psi)(gm) = g\psi(m). \tag{58}$$

This representation is exactly the "induced" representation of G constructed from the given one σ of the subgroup H. Moreover if σ is pseudo-unitary and it exists an invariant G-measure on M we can define an internal product $(,) : \Gamma(E) \times \Gamma(E) \to \mathbb{C}$ as:

$$< \psi, \phi >= \int_M d\mu h_m(\psi, \phi),$$

where h_m is the induced internal product on the fibre $\pi_E^{-1}(x)$.

In the specific case of semidirect product of groups i.e. $G = N \ltimes K$ (N abelian), one can define a G-action on the character space $\hat{N}$:

$$g\chi(gn) = \chi(n).$$

For any element χ_0 one can construct its stability (little) group $G_{\chi_0} : N \ltimes K_{\chi_0}$ and assign a representation $\sigma : K_{\chi_0} \to GL(V)$. This induces a representation $\chi_0\sigma : G_{\chi_0} \to V$ which associates with the couple (n,g) the element $\chi_0(n)\sigma(g)$. Thus in our diagram the group G_{χ_0} is playing the role of H and M becomes the coset space G/G_{χ_0}. The diagram is then:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
G(N \ltimes K_{\chi_0}, G/G_{\chi_0}) \arrow[r, dashed, "\chi_0\sigma"] \arrow[d, "\pi"] & GL(V) \arrow[d, dashed, "*"] \\
G/G_{\chi_0} & E(G/G_{\chi_0}, V) \arrow[l, "\pi_E"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since we want to describe vector valued functions $f : G/G_{\chi_0} \to V$, a representation of U can be made fixing a section $s : G/G_{\chi_0} \to G$ and remembering that for any element $\psi \in \Gamma(E)$ there exists a function $\tilde{f}_\psi : P \to V$:

$$\psi(\pi(u)) = [u, \tilde{f}_\psi(u)].$$

A vector valued function is:

$$f_\psi = \tilde{f}_\psi \circ s.$$

Let us notice that this construction makes sense only if the section s is global otherwise f is not defined everywhere; this happens only if the bundle G is trivial i.e. $G = M \times H$ which is always the case in the situation we are interested in.

Moreover equation (58) translates in:

$$[U(g)f_\psi]\,(gx) = \sigma(\gamma(g, x))f_\psi(x), \tag{59}$$

where in our case $\gamma : (N \ltimes K) \times G/G_{\chi_0} \to G_{\chi_0}$ is defined as:

$$s(gx)\gamma(g, x) = gs(x) \tag{60}$$

From now on we shall call (59) the *canonical (or induced) wave equation.*

In physical relevant situations covariant representations are used instead of induced ones. In this case we deal with a principal bundle $G(X, G_{x_0})$ where $x_0 \in X$ and the interesting representations are those preserving locality on the physical relevant space X and acting on a vector valued function $f : X \to V$ as:

$$[T(g)f](gx) = A(g, x)f(x), \tag{61}$$

where A is a map from $G \times X$ to $GL(V)$ satisfying the property:

$$A(g_1g_2, x) = A(g_1, g_2x)A(g_2, x).$$

Examples of these representations are those induced from the isotropy group G_{x_0} when expressed in term of sections $s : X \to G$. Let us also notice that there exists a map $\Sigma : G_{x_0} \to GL(V)$ assigning to an element γ the matrix $\Sigma(\gamma) = A(\gamma, x_0)$ and the induction of such a representation from the isotropy group to the entire G generates the representation

$$A'(g, x) = \Sigma(\gamma(g, x)),$$

where γ is defined as in (60) and $g = (\phi, \Lambda)$.

References

[1] G. 't Hooft, *"Dimensional reduction in Quantum Gravity"*, Essay published in Salamfest, 1993, p284; gr-qc/9310026.

[2] G. t' Hooft, *"Quantum gravity as a dissipative deterministic system"*, Class. Quant. Grav. **16** (1999) 3263, gr-qc/9903084.

[3] O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. M. Maldacena, H. Ooguri and Y. Oz, *"Large N field theories, string theory and gravity,"* Phys. Rept. **323** (2000) 183; hep-th/9905111.

[4] R. Bousso, *"The holographic principle"*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74** : 825-874, 2002.

[5] R. Sachs, *"Asymptotic symmetries in gravitational theory"*, Phys. Rev. **128**, 2851-64.

[6] K. Skenderis, *"Lecture notes on holographic renormalization,"* Class. Quant. Grav. **19** (2002) 5849; hep-th/0209067.

[7] H. Bondi, M.G.J. van der Burg and A.W.K. Metzner: *"Gravitational waves in general relatiivity VII. Waves from axi-symmetric isolated points"* Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **269** (1962) 21.

[8] L.A. Tamburino and J.H. Winicour, *"Gravitational fields in finite and conformal Bondi frames"*, Phys. Rev. **150**, 103 (1966).

[9] R. Geroch, *"Asymptotic structure of spacetime"* ed P. Esposito and L. Witten (New York: Plenum) 1977.

[10] R. Penrose, *"Group Theory in non linear problems"*, Chapter 1 Ed. A.O. Barut D.Reidel, Dodrecht-Holland/Boston-U.S.A.

[11] E.T. Newman and T.W. Unti: *"Behaviour of asymptotically flat spacetimes"*, J.Math.Phys. **3** 891-901 (1962).

[12] B.D. Bramson, *"The invariance of spin"*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London **364**, 383 (1978).

[13] A. Ashtekar, J. Bicak and B. G. Schmidt, *"Asymptotic structure of symmetry reduced general relativity,"* Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 669;gr-qc/9608042.

[14] A. Ashtekar, M. Streubel, *"On the angular momentum of stationary gravitating systems"* J. Math. Phys. **20**(7), 1362 (1979)

[15] R. Penrose, *"Quasi-Local Mass and Angular Momentum in General Relativity"*, Proc. R. Soc. London A **381**, 53 (1982)

[16] R. Penrose and W. Rindler, *"Spinors And Space-Time. Vol. 2: Spinor And Twistor Methods In Space-Time Geometry,"*, Cambridge University Press (1986).

[17] A. Ashtekar and A. Magnon, *"Asymptotically anti-de Sitter spacetimes"*, Class. Quant. Grav. **1** (1984) L39-L44.

[18] C. Fefferman and C. R.Graham, *"Conformal Invariants"* in *Elie Cartan et les mathématiques d'aujourd'hui* (Asterisque 1985) 95.

[19] E.N. Glass, *"A conserved Bach current"*, Class. Quantum Grav. **18** (2001) 3935.

[20] A.O. Barut, R. Raczka: *"Theory of group representation and applications"* World Scientific 2ed (1986),

[21] D.J. Simms: *"Lie groups and quantum mechanics"* Springer-Verlag (1968)

[22] L. O'Raifeartaigh in *"Group Representations in Mathematics and Physics"* Battelle Seattle 1969 Rencontres, edited by V. Bergmann, Springer-Verlarg (1970).

[23] P.J. McCarthy: *"Representations of the Bondi-Metzner-Sachs group I"* Proc. R. Soc. London **A330** 1972 (517),

[24] P.J. McCarthy: *"The Bondi-Metzner-Sachs in the nuclear topology"* Proc. R. Soc. London **A343** 1975 (489),

[25] P.J. McCarthy: *"Representations of the Bondi-Metzner-Sachs group II"* Proc. R. Soc. London **A333** 1973 (317),

[26] M. Crampin, P. J. McCarthy :*"Physical significance of the Topology of the Bondi-Metzner-Sachs"* Phys. Rev. Lett. **33** 1974 (547),

[27] A. Komar, *"Quantized gravitational theory and internal symmetries"*, Phys. Rev. Lett **15** (1965) 76

[28] L. Girardello, G. Parravicini: *"Continuous spins in the Bondi-Metzner-Sachs of asympotically symmetry in general relativity"* Phys. Rev. Lett. **32** 1974 (565)

[29] M. Asorey, L. J. Boya and J. F. Carinena, *"Covariant Representations In A Fiber Bundle Framework,"* Rept. Math. Phys. **21** (1986) 391.

[30] N. P. Landsman and U. A. Wiedemann, *"Massless particles, electromagnetism, and Rieffel induction,"* Rev. Math. Phys. **7** (1995) 923; hep-th/9411174.

[31] P.J. McCarthy *"Representations of the Bondi-Metzner-Sachs group III* Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A. **335** 301 (1973).

[32] P.J. McCarthy: *"Real and complex symmetries in quantum gravity, irreducible representations, polygons, polyhedra and the A.D.E. series"* Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London A **338** (1992) 271.

[33] A. Ashtekar and R.O. Hansen, *"A unified treatment of null and spatial infinity in general relativity. I. Universal structure, asymptotic symmetries and conserved quantities at spatial infinity"*, J. Math. Phys. **19**(7), 1542 (1978).

[34] J. de Boer and S. N. Solodukhin, *"A holographic reduction of Minkowski space-time,"*; hep-th/0303006.

[35] D. Berenstein, J. M. Maldacena and H. Nastase, *"Strings in flat space and pp waves from $N = 4$ super Yang Mills,"* JHEP **0204** (2002) 013; hep-th/0202021.

[36] G. Arcioni and C. Dappiaggi, work in progress.

[37] R. Bousso,*"Holography in general space-times"*, JHEP 9906:**028**,1999, hep-th/9906022.

[38] L. Susskind and E. Witten, *"The holographic bound in anti-de Sitter space,"*; hep-th/9805114.

[39] G. 't Hooft, *"The scattering matrix approach for the quantum black hole: an overview"*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **11** (1996) 4623 , gr-qc/9607022.

[40] V.P. Frolov, *"Null surface quantization and QFT in asymptotically flat space-time"*, Fortsch.Phys. **26**:455, 1978.

[41] P.J. McCarthy, *"Lifting of projective representations of the Bondi-Metzner-Sachs group* Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **358** no. 1693 (1978) 141.

[42] M. Reed, B. Simon, *"Methods of modern mathematical physics"* Academic Press (1975).

[43] S.B. Giddings, *"Flat-space scattering and bulk locality in the AdS/CFT correspondence"*, hep-th/9907129, Phys. Rev. **D61** (2000) 106008.

[44] O. Aharony and T. Banks, *"Note on the quantum mechanics of M theory,"* JHEP **9903** (1999) 016 [arXiv:hep-th/9812237].

[45] G.W. Mackey, *"Induced representations of locally compact groups I"* Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **35**, 537 (1949)